

**West Virginia  
Clean Water State Revolving Fund**



---

# **FY2012 Intended Use Plan**

Submitted to the  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Region III  
August 5, 2011



**west virginia department of environmental protection**

---

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

Glossary.....	1
Preface.....	2
<b>SECTION I</b>	
Introduction.....	3
<b>SECTION II</b>	
Funds Identification .....	3
<b>SECTION III</b>	
Goals.....	6
<b>SECTION IV</b>	
Project Priority List.....	8
<b>SECTION V</b>	
Fund Activities.....	9
<b>SECTION VI</b>	
Assurances .....	17
<b>SECTION VII</b>	
Criteria and Method for Distribution of Funds .....	18
<b>SECTION VIII</b>	
Public Participation.....	18
<b>SECTION IX</b>	
Agreement.....	19

## Appendices

- A - CWSRF Federal Capitalization Awards to WV
- B - FY 2012 Project Priority List
- C - Proposed Binding Commitments – by Quarter
- D - Projects Budgeted for IUP Available Funds
- E - Public Hearing Summary
- F - Median Household Income by Magisterial District
- F1 - Median Household Income by Municipality
- G - Sources and Uses Chart (for EPA use only)
- H - Possible Green Technology Projects

# Glossary

---

The following abbreviations are used throughout this document to denote the listed words, terms and phrases:

AgWQLP – West Virginia Agricultural Water Quality Loan Program

BAN – Bond Anticipation Note

CA – West Virginia Conservation Agency

CWA – Federal Clean Water Act

CWSRF – Clean Water State Revolving Fund

DEP – West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection

DWWM – Division of Water and Waste Management, DEP

EBPP – Extended Bond Purchase Program

EPA – United States Environmental Protection Agency

IJDC – West Virginia Infrastructure and Jobs Development Council

IUP – Intended Use Plan

MHI – Median Household Income

NRCS – Natural Resources Conservation Service

NPS – Nonpoint Source

OA – Operating Agreement

OSLP – Onsite Systems Loan Program

POTW – Publicly Owned Treatment Works

PSC – Public Service Commission

USDA– United States Department of Agriculture

SCD – Soil Conservation District

WDA – West Virginia Water Development Authority

# Preface

---

## **Mission Statements**

### **Department of Environmental Protection**

To promote a healthy environment.

---

### **Division of Water and Waste Management**

To protect, preserve and enhance West Virginia's land  
and watersheds for the safety  
and benefit of all.

---

### **Clean Water State Revolving Fund**

To provide technical and financial assistance to local governmental  
entities to improve water quality and  
public health conditions.

## SECTION I

# Introduction

---

This document is the Clean Water State Revolving Fund's Intended Use Plan for federal fiscal year 2012 (Oct. 1, 2011 – Sept. 30, 2012). The Division of Water and Waste Management is the primary state agency that administers the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, with financial and support assistance provided by the West Virginia Water Development Authority.

As of July 1, 2011, there have been 22 federal capitalization grants and amendments awarded by the Environmental Protection Agency. The state has provided the required 20% matching funds for each grant and amendment, where necessary. Relevant information on these federal grants can be found in Appendix A.

Repayments of prior loans, bonds and investment earnings are also available within the Clean Water State Revolving Fund to fund additional wastewater and nonpoint source projects. A calculation of available funds during FY2012 is contained in Section II.

## SECTION II

# Funds Identification

---

The charts on the next two pages identify the revenue sources that will be used for loans and other anticipated expenditure categories during FY2012.

A similar chart can be found in Appendix G, which is used by EPA for their purpose only. This chart summarizes the federal capitalization grants, state matches, repayments, earnings, etc. since the program began. It also estimates the FY2012 revenue sources and uses to calculate a theoretical amount of funds available.

## WEST VIRGINIA CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND

### Intended Use Plan – Sources and Uses of Funds

State FY2012 (July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012)

#### Available funds as of June 30, 2011:

Cash balance in CWSRF account =	\$ 90,045,003	
Federal funds accounts payable (Base grants) =	\$ 30,270,703	
ARRA Grant balance =	<u>\$ 3,467,133</u>	
		<u>\$123,782,839</u>

#### New funds available during state FY2012:

Next Federal EPA Grant (FY2011 Base funds) =	\$ 23,019,000	
Next State Match =	\$ 4,603,800	
Repayments (principal) (to 6/30/12) =	\$ 25,683,412	
Repayments (interest) (to 6/30/12) =	\$ 2,409,555	
Investment earnings (to 6/30/12) =	<u>\$ 172,000</u>	
		<u>\$ 55,887,767</u>

#### Less:

Existing project loans payables (6/30/11) =	\$ 53,936,204	
Existing binding commitments (6/30/11) =	\$119,030,432	
AgWQLP reserve =	\$ 100,000	
OSLP reserve =	\$ 300,000	
DEP Administration =	<u>\$ 0</u>	
		<u>\$ 173,366,636</u>

**Net available funds during FY2012 = \$ 6,303,970**

#### **Notes:**

- 1. \$16,247,855 remains to be used for loan forgiveness in all categories combined to meet the 2010 and 2011 grant conditions. No more than this can be used.**
- 2. There is \$7,210,334 that must still be allocated to green projects to meet the 2010 and 2011 grant conditions.**

**CWSRF ADMINISTRATIVE FEE ACCOUNT**  
**Sources and Uses of Fees**

**State FY2012 (July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012)**

**Available funds as of June 30, 2011:**

Cash balance =	\$ 5,401,171
----------------	--------------

**New funds available during state FY2012:**

Projected fee revenue from loans =	\$ 2,250,794
Investment earnings =	<u>\$ 8,200</u>
	\$ 2,258,994

**Less:**

CWSRF FY2012 administrative budget =	\$ 2,213,536
NPS specialist position =	\$ 88,782
Fiscal Services accountant position =	\$ 72,195
Project WET position =	\$ 93,740
DEP Central Office Support allocation =	<u>\$ 252,779</u>
	\$ 2,721,032

<b>Projected balance of account June 30, 2012 =</b>	<b>\$ 4,939,133</b>
---	---------------------

## SECTION III

# Goals

---

### A. Long term goals

1. **Expand CWSRF accessibility by creating new financial assistance programs to address NPS pollution control problems.**

Objective 1 – Consider establishing other funding programs within the CWSRF to correct and improve water quality using the West Virginia Watershed Management Framework process.

Objective 2 – Participate in other DWWM and DEP program areas to learn how the CWSRF might be able to provide funding opportunities during the implementation of appropriate water quality management activities, such as watershed assessments, the Chesapeake Bay Agreement, or revisions to the NPS management plan.

2. **Ensure the CWSRF program operates in perpetuity at its maximum level to provide financial assistance to local entities.**

Objective 1 – Conduct financial capability reviews on all potential loan recipients to assure credit worthiness and fiscal responsibility.

Objective 2 – Maximize investment opportunities.

Objective 3 – Monitor repayment activity of loan recipients and take aggressive action for collection of delinquent payments from loan recipients.

Objective 4 – Utilize EPA’s financial planning model to ascertain the long term effects of different CWSRF policies.

3. **Integrate CWSRF program into DEP’s Watershed Management Framework to increase program effectiveness.**

Objective 1 – Target CWSRF resources toward higher priority watersheds to correct as many pollution problems as possible using priority criteria.

Objective 2 – Assist other DWWM programs in public outreach efforts and assist in developing management strategies.

4. **Market the CWSRF program throughout the state to increase commitment of funds and maintain program pace.**

Objective 1 – Continue to provide informational articles on CWSRF program activities.

Objective 2 – Issue press releases on new program activities, developments and financial assistance provided to local entities.



Objective 3 – Participate in quarterly and annual meetings of all federal and state associations concerned with water quality, health and economic development issues.

Objective 4 – Provide presentations at various meetings on the status of the program.

**5. Participate in the monthly meetings of the IJDC.**

Objective 1 – Perform technical reviews on all proposed sewer projects to ensure appropriate technology will be used.

Objective 2 – Coordinate and recommend the most feasible funding sources in accordance with established state rules and procedures.

**6. Incorporate EPA’s strategic plan program activity measures into the CWSRF program implementation.**

Objective 1 - Achieve a targeted fund utilization rate of 100% (cumulative dollar amount of loan agreements divided by cumulative amount available for projects).

Objective 2 – Consider using an integrated planning and priority system to make CWSRF funding decisions.

Objective 3 – Monitor number and dollar value of projects financed with CWSRF loans to prevent polluted runoff from NPS areas.

Objective 4 – Monitor rate of return on federal investment (cumulative dollar amount of assistance disbursements to projects divided by cumulative federal outlays for projects).

**7. Develop effective wastewater management in rural, low income West Virginia communities.**

Objective 1 – Participate in groups to develop wastewater management ideas and programs.

Objective 2 – Encourage changes and increase collaboration at the county level.

Objective 3 – Investigate ways to create new funding opportunities for low income, unsewered communities.

**B. Short term goals for FY2012**

**1. Continue outreach efforts on new potential loan recipients.**

Objective – Each month identify and contact potential loan recipients who have obtained a CWSRF funding recommendation from the IJDC. Monitor the project as it proceeds through the planning and design phases.

**2. Review the current level of success of the Onsite Systems Loan Program.**

Objective 1 – Review the monthly financial reports from the West Virginia Housing Development Fund and other nonprofit organizations that are participating in the OSLP.

Objective 2 – Consider making changes in the program as necessary upon completion of the review.

**3. Achieve the targeted fund utilization rate “pace” goal of 95% in FY2012.**

Objective – Program pace is defined by EPA as the cumulative loan assistance provided divided by the total amount of funds available. Loan assistance is defined as the cumulative assistance provided by executed loan and bond agreements (does not include preliminary binding commitment letters). The CWSRF will do everything it can to convert the existing preliminary binding commitment letters to actual signed loan agreements in a timely manner.

**4. Complete environmental benefits “one-pagers” for all Section 212 and Section 319 Loans closed during FY2012.**

Objective – Document the environmental benefits of each project funded using both narrative and data compilation methods. Expected benefits include reduced bacteria levels in receiving streams and elimination of public health hazards within the community. Section 319 projects will be grouped by NPS activity.

**5. Participate in the State Continuing Planning Process initiated by the WV WDA and the Infrastructure and Jobs Development Council.**

## SECTION IV

# Project Priority List

---

The FY2012 Project Priority List is contained in Appendix B. The list includes potential CWSRF binding commitments for Section 212 projects (publicly owned treatment works). Projects must appear on the priority list in order to receive consideration for a loan/bond purchase agreement or a formal loan commitment. The list was developed using fact sheets received from the applicant, consulting engineer or other representative, and should reflect current costs. If additional projects are developed during the fiscal year that do not appear on the list but would like to receive a commitment, they may be added to the list after adequate public notification procedures have been completed. This generally takes 60 days.

The CWSRF will continue to commit funds to projects on a first-come first-served basis regardless of their position on the priority list, as long as all applicable program requirements have been met. Further, a project will not receive a commitment from the CWSRF unless it has received a funding recommendation from the IJDC in accordance with WV State Code, Chapter 31, Article 15A (see Section III.B.1). This binding commitment from the CWSRF will remain in effect until the expiration date contained in the commitment.

Individual NPS pollution control activities and projects funded by the CWSRF do not have to appear on the annual priority list. However, the funding of these projects is described in Section V(I) and an amount has been reserved to fund these projects. These NPS projects are allowable for funding using state revolving funds in accordance with federal law and are defined under Section 319 of the CWA. Any type of NPS activities funded must be included in the DEP's approved NPS management plan. Appendix D contains a quarterly outlay estimate for all NPS activities expected to be funded in FY2012.

## SECTION V

# Fund Activities

---

### A. Interest rates on POTW loans

The eligibility criterion for low interest loan consideration is still based upon 4,000 gallons of water usage and the definition for a disadvantaged community is the same as it was in fiscal year 2011. The average monthly user rate must be at or above 1.5% of the median household income in order for a community to qualify for a 0% interest rate on its loan.

The DEP will be using this criterion to determine its interest rate on loans. However, the maximum allowable term of the loans will be determined using the following range of user rates and MHI data:

*Less than 1.5% MHI: 2% interest rate, 1% annual admin fee, 20 year term*

*1.5% to 1.74% MHI: 0% interest rate, ½ % annual admin fee, 21 - 30 year term*

*1.75% MHI and higher: 0% interest rate, ½% annual admin fee, 31 - 40 year term*

The MHI data that will be used will be the 2000 census data published by the Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census until the 2010 census data is released. Only projects that have a valid binding commitment letter and have filed for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity with the PSC will proceed to project closing with the 2000 MHI data. All others will have their terms reevaluated using the 2010 MHI data. Interest rates will not exceed 2% and will not be less than 0%. For all public service districts, the MHI to be used will be the magisterial district that is most appropriate for the project area. This information can be found in Appendix F. Municipalities specific MHI data will be used for them as contained in Appendix F1.

Should Congress amend the CWA or pass reform legislation that affects small disadvantaged communities, the DEP may revise this interest rate policy to consider other factors as required by federal law.

## **B. Additional subsidization for disadvantaged communities**

The FY2011 Clean Water Act Title VI funding allocation for West Virginia will be \$23,019,000. The Appropriations Act requires that a portion of each capitalization grant be used for additional loan subsidization and for funding green infrastructure projects.

The Act requires a minimum of 20% be set aside for funding green projects. This amount is equal to \$4,603,800. The allowable green project categories that will be considered for this funding are described below.

The Act also requires a minimum amount be set aside for providing additional loan subsidization in the form of grants or principal forgiveness to qualifying communities. This minimum amount is \$2,133,076. The Act also allows for a maximum amount to be set aside, which is equal to \$7,110,255. In accordance with the CWSRF state statute, which says in part, "...moneys in the fund shall be used to make grants for projects to the extent allowed or authorized by federal law", the DEP will be setting aside the maximum amount which will be used for providing additional loan subsidies for disadvantaged communities.

Principal forgiveness of all or part of a loan will be the mechanism that will be used to supply the additional subsidization. The criteria for projects to be eligible for additional subsidization are as follows:

1. Additional loan subsidization for disadvantaged communities will only be provided as a last resort when other funding options within the CWSRF program are not practical to make the project financially affordable (i.e. 40-year loan terms, deferred principal repayments, reduced debt service coverage, etc.).
2. The proposed average sewer rate based upon 4,000 gallons of water usage after project completion must be equal to or greater than 1.75% of the median household income based upon the census data as described in Section V(A). The additional loan subsidization provided will be the lesser of 50% of the total eligible CWSRF project costs or \$1,000,000.
3. If the proposed average rate is equal to or greater than 2.0% MHI, then the additional loan subsidization amount will be the lesser of 100% of the total eligible CWSRF project costs or \$2,000,000.

Readiness to proceed to construction will be the primary criterion that will be used in allocating the additional subsidies. The final amount of the subsidy will be determined after receipt of bids and after a formal application is submitted. Note: As existing debt is retired, it will rollover to pay the amount of any deferred loan.

Loan recipients eligible for additional subsidization must appear on the current FY2012 priority list prior to loan closing.

### **C. Green Projects Reserve**

In accordance with federal law, to the extent there are sufficient eligible project applications, not less than 20% of the funds in the FY2011 capitalization grant shall be used to address green infrastructure projects. A loan subsidization amount not to exceed \$4,603,800 will be reserved for green technology type projects until the 20% requirement is met.

Allowable green project categories will be as follows:

#### **1. Energy Efficiency**

A community may use improved technologies and practices to reduce the energy consumption of existing wastewater treatment systems, use energy in a more efficient way, and/or produce/utilize renewable energy. Only the dollar amount associated with the green component of a larger project will qualify for the green reserve.

Proposed green projects in this category will be eligible to receive additional loan subsidization, in the form of debt forgiveness, to the lesser of 20% of the total eligible green CWSRF costs or \$500,000.

Projects that will not be allowable include but are not limited to:

- a. Infiltration and inflow pipe repair or replacement.
- b. Purchase of hybrid/alternative fuel vehicles for sewer fleets.
- c. Operation, maintenance and replacement activities.
- d. Drinking water related projects.

#### **2. Water Efficiency**

Water efficiency type projects will not be allowable for additional loan subsidization or green technology funding, except for water reuse type projects. Proposed green projects in the water reuse category will be eligible to receive additional loan subsidization, in the form of debt forgiveness, to the lesser of 20% of the total eligible green CWSRF costs or \$500,000.

#### **3. Storm Water / Green Infrastructure**

Allowable green projects to be funded under this category are:

- a. Publicly sponsored projects that utilize green technologies to treat or eliminate storm water from existing wastewater collection and treatment systems.
- b. MS4 sponsored projects that utilize green technologies to solve storm water issues.

Proposed green projects in this category will be eligible to receive additional loan subsidization, in the form of debt forgiveness, to the lesser of 20% of the total eligible green CWSRF costs or \$500,000.

#### **4. Environmentally Innovative**

Allowable green projects to be funded in this category are:

Decentralized sewer systems

- a. Publicly Owned Systems
- b. Privately Owned Onsite Systems

For constructing, upgrading, or repairing onsite/septic systems to existing eligible structures to protect water quality. The project must be sponsored by a local entity eligible to receive SRF funding.

Proposed green projects in this category will be eligible to receive loan subsidization, in the form of debt forgiveness, of 100% of the total eligible green CWSRF costs.

During FY 2012, the CWSRF program will be piloting a design program for categorically green decentralized sewer system projects only. The program will fund the design of these systems from the available green debt forgiveness funds. Only the engineering fees required for the design will be eligible. In order to qualify for these funds, the project sponsor must assure the CWSRF program that the project will proceed to construction within 12 to 18 months of receiving the funds. The sponsor will have to provide, at a minimum, the following documentation:

1. A recommendation to pursue SRF funds from the WV Infrastructure and Jobs Development Council;
2. An engineering agreement approved by the CWSRF program;
3. A facility plan approved by the CWSRF program;
4. Documentation of a pre-design meeting with representatives of the CWSRF program;
5. A project timeline with an approvable project budget;
6. Documentation from the project sponsor that the customer base is willing to pay the proposed sewer rate;
7. PSC approval, if required by law.

Based upon the above guidelines and criteria, a list of potential green projects is included in Appendix H of this document. These projects were submitted in response to a DEP solicitation for green projects that occurred in May and June, 2011 with a submittal deadline of June 15, 2011. The CWSRF program will further evaluate these projects to determine funding eligibility.

#### **D. Annual administrative fees on POTW loans**

Since 1994, an annual administrative fee has been charged on all loans as a means of supporting the future administrative costs of operating the CWSRF in perpetuity. These fees are maintained in a separate account outside the CWSRF. The use of these fees is restricted in accordance with *EPA's Guidance on Fees Charged by States to Recipients of Clean Water State Revolving Program Assistance* as published in the

Federal Register on October 20, 2006. Funds have been expended from the account since FY1998. In FY2012, the administrative fee account will be used for all administrative expenditures of the CWSRF. The 4% set-aside allowed in the next federal capitalization grant will not be used for administrative purposes, making more money available for funding projects.

The annual administrative fee is calculated annually using the outstanding principle amount of the loan over its life, but repaid over the term of loan in equal installments as contained in the loan amortization schedule. The chart in Section V (A) will be used to determine the annual administrative fee on each loan. The CWSRF administrative budget for state FY2012 is \$ 2,213,536.

**E. Maximum allowable loans**

In FY2012, there will not be a limit set on the amount of funds available to any single project. This practice will be reviewed annually and may change in future intended use plans.

**F. BAN leveraging program**

DEP is continuing the following option for multimillion dollar projects that cannot reduce their scope to reflect a reasonable cost. A specific dollar amount will be issued by the entity using a BAN (Bond Anticipation Note) for the length of the construction period. The CWSRF will commit out of its second round funds a certain amount each fiscal year until the total commitment is equal to the BAN. The loan will then be closed following construction completion, retiring the interim financing. This proposed closing date will also be reflected in the BAN documents. Repayment of the CWSRF loan will begin immediately using the first full Municipal Bond Commission quarter following loan closing.

**G. Extended Bond Purchase Program**

**1. 30-year bonds**

The EPA approval of the 30-year extended bond purchase program on April 13, 1999, allowed many disadvantaged communities in West Virginia to be funded under the CWSRF, resulting in additional water quality improvement projects and providing rate relief to local governmental entities. The more advantageous bond terms have increased the number of sewer construction projects in the state and have allowed better leveraging of other state and federal funds available for sewer projects.

Section 603(d)(2) of the CWA allows local bonds to be purchased by the state at below market interest rates without limiting the term to 20 years as contained in Section 603(d)(1). West Virginia law governing municipalities and public service districts provides that governing bodies must issue bonds to pay the costs of wastewater projects and sets forth detailed terms regarding interest rates, maturity dates and security provisions and with certain exceptions provides that the term of such bonds shall not exceed 40 years from the date of issuance.

Under the EBPP, the CWSRF will be purchasing local bonds with up to 30-year terms only for disadvantaged communities defined in Section V (A). Extended terms up to 30 years will be available to eligible communities meeting the above definition after a request is received from the community and an affordability analysis has been performed to determine what maturity date is necessary (not exceeding 30 years) in achieving, if possible, the targeted rate equal to 1.50% MHI. In performing the analysis, an interest rate of 0% and an annual administrative fee of 0.5% shall be assumed.

Loans closed before July 2, 1999, cannot be refinanced or restructured using extended bond terms unless:

- a. DEP determines that such restructuring is necessary to protect the integrity of the CWSRF;
- b. the financial difficulty is due to unforeseen events (except population decline);
- c. the community has taken all reasonable steps to reduce expenses and increase revenues and such measures have not remedied the financial difficulty;
- d. the community has not discriminated in its payment of debt service on other outstanding debt;
- e. the community agrees to and implements a long term management plan; and
- f. the PSC has approved the proposed restructuring, (if applicable).

## 2. 40-year bonds

In May 2001, EPA approved an extension to the 30-year extended bond purchase program by allowing bond terms to exceed 30 years, but no longer than 40 years. As with the 30-year bond program, offering up to 40-year terms requires that the long term revolving nature of the CWSRF must be protected. The offering of extended financing terms must not decrease the projected revolving level of the fund by 10% or more compared to the revolving level that the fund would have attained if extended financing terms were not available.

In implementing this 40-year program and in consideration of the federal mandates, the DEP established the following parameters that must be met by a disadvantaged community in order to be eligible for extended bond terms greater than 30 and less or equal to 40 years. The intent is to balance the financial need of the community with the long term financial health of the CWSRF.

Facility plans will include detailed information concerning expected increases in operation and maintenance costs from years 20 to 40 including, but not limited to schedules for the repair and replacement of all facility units / components, including equipment.

Where there has been a historical decline in population, additional information in the facility plan will be required concerning the composition of the population base, such as age and income characteristics. Other economic indicators, such as



trends in tax base, number of jobs and housing starts, may be requested to determine those communities that pose a high risk to the CWSRF program.

For revenue projection and rate-setting purposes, the CWSRF will require that only 90% of any new potential customers be used in the facility plan. This requirement will apply during the entire preconstruction phase of the project, including the Public Service Commission certificate case. A copy of the Rule 42 exhibit shall be submitted to the DEP for compliance review with this requirement. This requirement will not apply to existing customers already served by a collection system.

At the completion of final design and prior to the project authorization to advertise for bids, the above information will be reviewed for the purposes of conducting a final financial review.

#### **H. Requirements for CWSRF Commitment**

Preliminary Commitments – when IJDC or another funding agency commits funds to a project that includes CWSRF as a funding partner, the DEP may also commit its funding to the project at that time, conditioned upon program requirements being met in the future as the project proceeds.

Formal Commitments – once it has been determined that a project can realistically proceed to construction within six months, a formal commitment of CWSRF funding will be made that may include such terms and conditions as deemed necessary. Prior to loan closing, the project must appear on the current year's priority list.

#### **I. Expanded uses of the CWSRF – Nonpoint Sources (NPS)**

In addition to financing municipal sewage treatment and disposal projects, the CWSRF can finance an array of environmental projects to address NPS pollution. NPS pollution is runoff from areas that have hard-to-trace specific sources of pollution such as farmland and suburban neighborhoods.

As with most other states, West Virginia has devoted the majority of CWSRF funds to the construction of traditional municipal wastewater treatment systems. However, in 1997 the CWSRF funded its first NPS water quality projects through the DEP's Agricultural Water Quality Loan Program in partnership with the WV Conservation Agency. The purpose of the AgWQL program is to provide a source of low-interest financing match funds to implement best management practices that will reduce NPS impacts on water quality. This program is operated in conjunction with local participating banks.

In 2000, the CWSRF began a pilot implementation of its second NPS program titled the Onsite Systems Loan Program. The purpose of this program was to eliminate existing health hazards and water quality problems due to direct sewage discharges from houses using malfunctioning septic tank systems or direct pipes to a nearby stream. This was a cooperative venture between the DEP and county health departments. After several years of frustration, this program was revived in

2008 and is now fully operational. The West Virginia Housing Development Fund and other nonprofit associations are participating in this program to make it accessible to individual homeowners throughout the state.

In creating the CWSRF, Congress ensured that it would be able to fund virtually any type of water quality project, including nonpoint source, wetlands, estuary, and other types of watershed projects, as well as more traditional municipal wastewater treatment systems. The CWSRF provisions in the CWA give no more preference to one category or type of project than any other.

#### 1. Agriculture Water Quality Loan Program

With the initiation of the FY1998 pilot program in five counties (Grant, Mineral, Pendleton, Hardy, and Hampshire), DEP addressed nonpoint sources of pollution by the installation of best management practices. The pilot program was a cooperative effort among the DEP, WV Conservation Agency, United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, local Soil Conservation Districts and local banking institutions.

Agricultural producers at the local level work with the SCD, CA and NRCS to develop a conservation plan. A local participating bank then provides a 2% interest loan for construction that will be monitored by these agencies. The CWSRF loans money to local banks at 0% interest as a mechanism for the banks to reduce their interest rate. The DEP expanded this program statewide after securing EPA approval to do so. As of June 30, 2011, more than \$6 million has been loaned under this program for installation of best management practices. Each fiscal year, an additional amount of money is set aside to fund more of these NPS projects. A one-time administrative fee is charged on each loan to cover DEP administrative expenses.

The CWSRF will continue this program in FY2012 with a set-aside reserve of \$100,000 to provide the necessary match to these agriculture grants.

#### 2. Onsite Systems Loan Program

An OSLP guidance document is available which explains the NPS program. Individual loans are limited to \$10,000 and lender interest rates cannot exceed 2% with terms not to exceed 10 years for the replacement, repair or upgrade of onsite sewage systems. Exceptions to the \$10,000 limit are made on a case-by-case basis.

During the 2007 legislative session, the CWSRF statute was amended to expand the definition of “local entity”, which allows CWSRF money to be loaned to other entities who will act as an intermediary lender in the OSLP. The West Virginia Housing Development Fund was the first entity to enter into an agreement with the CWSRF to provide low interest loans to homeowners to correct failing onsite sewage systems. SAFE Housing and Economic Development, Inc. (SHED) has also entered into an agreement with the CWSRF to provide these loans to homeowners. The CWSRF will provide \$300,000 as a set-aside for this program in FY2012.

### 3. Other CWA Section 319 Nonpoint Source Activities

Nonpoint sources of water pollution, that may include contaminated groundwater flow and runoff from agricultural and developed land, have received far less attention. This is because nonpoint sources of pollution are harder to identify and address since they are not discrete end-of-pipe pollution sources.

In West Virginia, other nonpoint sources of pollution are identified in the state nonpoint source management plan developed by DEP. We will continue to evaluate the merits of providing funds to other NPS activities.

#### **J. Federal requirements**

To streamline the program and reduce project costs, all new binding commitments made to POTW projects in FY2012 will not have to meet many federal requirements. As a recipient of federal CWSRF funds, the DEP has to apply these federal requirements to loans equal to the cumulative amounts of all the federal capitalization grants. The DEP has consistently applied these federal requirements to all loans since the beginning of the program in 1991. DEP has met this federal requirement at 123% of what is required. Therefore, many federal requirements will not be imposed on projects in FY2012, such as minority/woman-owned business enterprise goals, presidential executive orders, just to name a few. Recipients of earmark grants from Congress will still have to meet these federal requirements for the entire project, including any CWSRF funds. This will likely continue in future fiscal years.

## SECTION VI

# Assurances

---

DEP has provided the necessary assurances and certifications as part of the operating agreement with EPA. The Operating Agreement defines the mutual obligations between EPA and DEP. The purpose of the OA is to provide a framework of procedures to be followed in the management and administration of the CWSRF. The OA includes the requirements of the following sections of the federal Clean Water Act:

- 602(a) - Environmental Reviews – the DEP will conduct the reviews in accordance with state regulations.
- 602(b)(3) - Binding Commitments – the DEP will enter into binding commitments for 120% of each quarterly grant payment within one year of receipt of the payment.
- 602(b)(4) - Expeditious and Timely Expenditures – the DEP will expend all funds in the CWSRF in a timely manner.
- 602(b)(5) - First Use for Enforceable Requirements – the DEP has certified that all national municipal policy projects have met this requirement.

These and other procedures are described in the OA and may be examined by contacting the DEP. The OA is currently undergoing revision due to the many changes in the program since its inception in 1989.

## SECTION VII

# Criteria and method for distribution of funds

---

The following approach was used to update the priority list, intended use plan and projection of the distribution of all funds contained in the CWSRF:

1. Analysis of community and financial assistance needed;
2. Review of project schedule to determine when the project would be in a state of readiness to proceed to construction;
3. Individual contact with potential loan recipient or its representative;
4. Allocation of funds among projects;
5. Development of an EPA payment schedule which will provide for making timely binding commitments to projects selected for CWSRF financial assistance;
6. Development of individual disbursement schedules to pay project costs as incurred;
7. Analysis of NPS activities and the extent to which reserved funds would be needed for such projects; and
8. Estimate of administrative expenditures that will occur during the fiscal year.

## SECTION VIII

# Public participation

---

On July 22, 2011 a public hearing was held to receive comments on the CWSRF IUP for FY2012. The meeting was legally advertised in newspapers throughout the state. There was only one attendee from the general public and the CWSRF's bond counsel at the meeting.

Appendix E contains the public hearing notice, attendance sign-in sheet and a summary of the meeting.

## SECTION IX

# Agreement

---

The DEP has agreed to provide EPA with information for the environmental results sheets for all loans closed during FY2012. This new documentation is being requested by EPA to better ascertain the environmental results of projects funded under the CWSRF program.

APPENDIX A

CWSRF  
Federal Capitalization Awards  
to West Virginia

---

**WEST VIRGINIA STATE REVOLVING FUND - CAPITALIZATION GRANT AWARDS -as of June 30, 2011**

DATE	FED. AMOUNT	SOURCE FY FUNDS	FY SOURCE	STATE MATCH REQUIRED	STATE MATCH COMMITTED	DIFF.	CUM. DIFF.
FY90 GRANT 8/31/90	\$20,889,974	14,703,579 6,186,395	89 90	2,940,716 1,237,279			
	\$20,889,974			\$4,177,995	\$4,100,000 (91)	(\$77,995)	(\$77,995)
FY91 GRANT 9/30/91	\$31,353,287	9,022,678 22,330,609	90 91	1,804,535 4,466,122			
	\$31,353,287			\$6,270,657	\$5,450,000 (92)	(\$820,657)	(\$898,652)
FY92 GRANT 9/30/92	\$9,661,835	\$9,661,835	91	\$1,932,367	\$2,831,018 (93)	\$898,651	(\$1)
FY93 GRANT 9/29/93	\$30,288,852	\$30,288,852	92	\$6,057,770	\$6,057,770 (94)	(\$0)	(\$1)
FY94 GRANT 9/12/94	\$29,962,449	\$29,962,449	93	\$5,992,490	\$5,992,490 (95)	\$0	(\$1)
FY95 GRANT 1/27/95	\$37,792,161	18,591,309 19,200,852 37,792,161	94 95	3,718,262 3,840,170 7,558,432	3,718,262 3,840,170 7,558,432 (96)	0 (0)	(1) (1)
FY97 GRANT 9/30/97	31,451,607	3,498,858 27,952,749 31,451,607 9,713,600 41,165,207	95 96 97	699,771 5,590,550 6,290,321 1,942,720 8,233,041	0	0 0 0 0	(1) 0 0 0
FY98 GRANT 9/25/98	20,991,267	20,991,267	98	4,198,253	4,198,253 (98)	0	0
FY99 GRANT 9/21/1999	20,993,049	20,993,049	99	4,198,610	4,198,610	2000	0
FY00 GRANT 9/21/00	20,921,868	20,921,868	2000	4,184,374	4,184,373	2000	(1) 0
FY01 GRANT 9/19/01	20,735,946	20,735,946	2001	4,147,189	4,147,189	2001	0 0
FY03 GRANT 1/2/2003 FY03 Grant Inc.	20,782,080 77,200	20,782,080 77,200	2002	4,156,416 15,440	4,171,893	2003	0 0 37 36
FY04 GRANT 9/28/04	20,821,900	20,821,900	2003	4,164,380	4,174,379	2004	9,999 10,035
FY05 GRANT 3/16/05	20,637,300	20,637,300	2004	4,127,460	4,132,938	2005	5,478 15,513
FY05 AMEND. 9/28/05	16,798,100	16,798,100	2005	3,359,620	3,367,686	2006	8,066 23,579
FY06 GRANT 9/20/06	13,650,912	13,650,912	2006	2,730,182	2,730,182	2007	8,066 23,579
FY07 GRANT 9/26/07	16,684,470	16,684,470	2007	3,336,894	3,336,894	2007	8,066 23,579
FY08 GRANT 9/24/08	10,607,850	10,607,850	2008	2,121,570	2,121,570	2008	0 23,579
FY09 ARRA GRANTS 3/27/09+8/27/09	61,092,100	61,092,100	2009 ARRA	n/a	n/a		
FY09 GRANT 9/30/09	10,607,850	10,607,850	2009	2,121,570	2,121,570	2009	0 23,579
FY2010 GRANT 8/26/10	31,762,000	31,762,000	2010	6,352,400	6,352,400	2010	0 23,579
FY2010 AMEND. 11/30/10	277,929 (trans SMAG \$)			55,585	55,585 (from admin fee acct.)		
22 grants+amends	508,555,586	FEDERAL		89,492,695	STATE 89,516,273		23,578
				598,048,281	TOTAL		
FUTURE GRANTS FY2011 GRANT ?	23,019,000	23,019,000	2011	4,603,800	4,603,800	2011	

APPENDIX B

FISCAL YEAR 2012  
PRIORITY LIST

---



# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2012 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> 1	<b>Brooke County PSD</b> County: Brooke SRF #C544: 006-02 NPDES #WV: 0084182 Points: 160.00 Binding Date: 9/30/12 Needs Category: IVA,IVB	\$2,460,000	\$9,822,000	<b>Problem</b> Failing septic systems <b>Solution</b> Extend sewer service to unserved areas
<b>Rank</b> 2	<b>McDowell PSD</b> County: McDowell SRF #C544: 472- NPDES #WV: 0115011 Points: 160.00 Binding Date: 9/30/12 Needs Category: IVA,IVB	\$1,000,000	\$6,710,000	<b>Problem</b> Failing septic systems <b>Solution</b> Extend sewer service to unserved areas
<b>Rank</b> 3	<b>New Creek PSD</b> County: Mineral SRF #C544: 044- NPDES #WV: 0085456 Points: 150.00 Binding Date: 9/30/12 Needs Category: IVA,IVB	\$6,716,000	\$6,716,000	<b>Problem</b> Failing septic systems <b>Solution</b> Extend sewer service to unserved areas
<b>Rank</b> 4	<b>Claywood Park PSD/Newark Phase II</b> County: Wood SRF #C544: 419-02 NPDES #WV: 0143991 Points: 147.00 Binding Date: 9/30/12 Needs Category: IVA,IVB	\$713,000	\$2,213,200	<b>Problem</b> Direct discharge, failing septic systems <b>Solution</b> Extend sewer service to unserved areas

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI Storm Water Controls

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> 5	<b><u>Delbarton, Town of</u></b>  <b>County:</b> Mingo <b>SRF #C544:</b> 414- <b>NPDES #WV:</b> 0042374 <b>Points</b> 147.00 <b>Binding Date:</b> 12/30/11 <b>Needs Category:</b> I,IVA,IVB	\$7,741,620	\$10,693,420	<b>Problem</b> Existing treatment plant is out of compliance & sludge disposal is inadequate, collection system severe I/I, failing septic systems <b>Solution</b> Upgrade WWTP, rehabilitate collection system and extend sewer service to unserved areas
<b>Rank</b> 6	<b><u>Weston-Turnertown Butchersville</u></b>  <b>County:</b> Lewis <b>SRF #C544:</b> 471- <b>NPDES #WV:</b> 0028088 <b>Points</b> 147.00 <b>Binding Date:</b> 9/30/12 <b>Needs Category:</b> IIIB	\$5,187,000	\$5,187,000	<b>Problem</b> Failing septic system and package plant <b>Solution</b> Extend sewer service to unserved areas
<b>Rank</b> 7	<b><u>Greater Harrison Co. PSD</u></b>  <b>County:</b> Harrison <b>SRF #C544:</b> 451- <b>NPDES #WV:</b> 0084301 <b>Points</b> 145.00 <b>Binding Date:</b> 3/31/12 <b>Needs Category:</b> I,IVA,IVB	\$15,500,000	\$15,664,000	<b>Problem</b> Failing package plant and severe I/I issues <b>Solution</b> Construct new WWTP and collection system
<b>Rank</b> 8	<b><u>Claywood Park PSD/Newark Phase I</u></b>  <b>County:</b> Wood <b>SRF #C544:</b> 419-01 <b>NPDES #WV:</b> 0043991 <b>Points</b> 142.00 <b>Binding Date:</b> 9/30/12 <b>Needs Category:</b> I,IIIB,IVA,IVB	\$1,925,000	\$4,050,000	<b>Problem</b> Direct discharge, failing septic systems <b>Solution</b> Extend sewer service to unserved areas

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI Storm Water Controls

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> 9	<b>Westover, City of</b>  <b>County:</b> Monongalia <b>SRF #C544:</b> 435- <b>NPDES #WV:</b> 0024449 <b>Points</b> 140.00 <b>Binding Date:</b> 6/30/12 <b>Needs Category:</b> IVA.IVB.V	\$1,564,000	\$2,364,000	<b>Problem</b> Failing septic systems and working toward CSO compliance  <b>Solution</b> Extend sewer service to unserved areas and development of a CSO Long-Term Control Plan and system mapping
<b>Rank</b> 10	<b>Vienna, City of</b>  <b>County:</b> Wood <b>SRF #C544:</b> 469- <b>NPDES #WV:</b> 0023221 <b>Points</b> 137.00 <b>Binding Date:</b> 9/30/12 <b>Needs Category:</b> IVA.IVB	\$500,000	\$500,000	<b>Problem</b> Failing package plant and septic systems  <b>Solution</b> Extend sewer service to unserved areas
<b>Rank</b> 11	<b>Elk Valley PSD Phase II</b>  <b>County:</b> Kanawha <b>SRF #C544:</b> 400-02 <b>NPDES #WV:</b> 0080900 <b>Points</b> 135.00 <b>Binding Date:</b> 6/30/12 <b>Needs Category:</b> IVA	\$15,000,000	\$15,000,000	<b>Problem</b> Failing septic systems and corrosion in their main interceptor  <b>Solution</b> Extend sewer service to unserved areas and replace failing interceptor
<b>Rank</b> 12	<b>Enlarged Hepzibah PSD</b>  <b>County:</b> Harrison <b>SRF #C544:</b> 463- <b>NPDES #WV:</b> 0081001 <b>Points</b> 135.00 <b>Binding Date:</b> 9/30/12 <b>Needs Category:</b> IIIA.IVA.IVB	\$400,000	\$3,500,000	<b>Problem</b> Failing septic systems and direct discharge  <b>Solution</b> Extend sewer service to unserved areas

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI Storm Water Controls

Rank / Points		Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b>		<b><u>Nitro, City of</u></b>	\$5,859,500	\$5,867,000	<b>Problem</b>
13		County: Kanawha			Failing septic system, excessive I/I and sludge handling difficulties at the WWTP
		SRF #C544: 273-			
		NPDES #WV: 0023299			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 9/30/12			Extend sewer service to unserved areas, sanitary/storm sewer separation, replace belt filter press at the WWTP
135.00		Needs Category: I,IIIA,IIIB,IVA,IVB			
<b>Rank</b>		<b><u>Shinnston</u></b>	\$3,821,785	\$3,821,785	<b>Problem</b>
14		County: Harrison			Failing septic systems
		SRF #C544: 109-			
		NPDES #WV: 0054500			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 9/30/12			Extend sewer service to unserved areas
135.00		Needs Category: IVA,IVB			
<b>Rank</b>		<b><u>Sophia, Town of</u></b>	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	<b>Problem</b>
15		County: Raleigh			Failing septic systems and package plants
		SRF #C544: 085-			
		NPDES #WV: 0024422			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 9/30/12			Extend sewer service to unserved areas and eliminate package plants
132.00		Needs Category: IVA,IVB			
<b>Rank</b>		<b><u>Chelyan PSD</u></b>	\$3,384,000	\$10,278,000	<b>Problem</b>
16		County: Kanawha			Failing septic systems
		SRF #C544: 222-03			
		NPDES #WV: 0038776			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 3/31/12			Extend sewer service to unserved areas
130.00		Needs Category: IVA,IVB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI Storm Water Controls

Rank / Points		Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b>		<b><u>Greenbrier PSD #1</u></b>	\$4,293,594	\$4,353,594	<b>Problem</b>
17		County: Greenbrier			Failing septic systems
		SRF #C544: 449-			
		NPDES #WV: 0089010			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 3/31/12			Extend sewer service to unserved areas
130.00		Needs Category: IVA,IVB			
<b>Rank</b>		<b><u>Marshall County SD</u></b>	\$2,400,000	\$5,480,000	<b>Problem</b>
18		County: Marshall			Failing septic systems
		SRF #C544: 473-			
		NPDES #WV: 0081612			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 3/31/12			Extend sewer service to unserved areas
130.00		Needs Category: IVA,IVB			
<b>Rank</b>		<b><u>Mason County PSD</u></b>	\$6,600,000	\$7,500,000	<b>Problem</b>
19		County: Mason			Failing septic systems and package plant
		SRF #C544: 407-			
		NPDES #WV: 0105619			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 6/30/12			Construct new WWTP and extend sewer service to unserved areas
125.00		Needs Category: I,IVA,IVB			
<b>Rank</b>		<b><u>Northern Wayne PSD</u></b>	\$2,372,000	\$2,372,000	<b>Problem</b>
20		County: Wayne			Failing septic systems
		SRF #C544: 402-			
		NPDES #WV: 0089621			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 9/30/12			Extend sewer service to unserved areas
125.00		Needs Category: IVA			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI Storm Water Controls

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> 21	<b>Preston Co. Sewer PSD</b> County: Preston SRF #C544: 487- NPDES #WV: 0025101 Points 125.00 Binding Date: 3/31/12 Needs Category: II,IVA,IVB	\$1,805,000	\$1,805,000	<b>Problem</b> Failing treatment plant and septic systems <b>Solution</b> Construct decentralized treatment plant and collection system
<b>Rank</b> 22	<b>Sistersville, City of</b> County: Tyler SRF #C544: 467- NPDES #WV: 0021814 Points 125.00 Binding Date: 9/30/12 Needs Category: IVA,IVB	\$1,100,000	\$1,100,000	<b>Problem</b> Direct discharge from community wastewater collection system <b>Solution</b> Connect the collection system to an existing wastewater treatment plant
<b>Rank</b> 23	<b>Crab Orchard MacArthur-MFSur</b> County: Raleigh SRF #C544: 387-01 NPDES #WV: 0082309 Points 120.00 Binding Date: 9/30/12 Needs Category: II,IIIB,IVA,IVB	\$15,100,000	\$15,100,000	<b>Problem</b> Failing package plants and septic systems <b>Solution</b> Construct central WWTP and collection system
<b>Rank</b> 24	<b>Crab Orchard McArthur-HE</b> County: Raleigh SRF #C544: 388- NPDES #WV: 0082309 Points 120.00 Binding Date: 9/30/12 Needs Category: I,IVA,IVB	\$6,921,000	\$10,352,000	<b>Problem</b> Failing septic systems and direct discharges <b>Solution</b> Construct WWTP and collection system

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI Storm Water Controls

Rank / Points		Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b>		<b><u>Crab Orchard-MacArthur-MF</u></b>	\$22,590,000	\$22,590,000	<b>Problem</b>
25		County: Raleigh			Failing septic systems and direct discharges
		SRF #C544: 484-			
		NPDES #WV: 0082309			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 9/30/12			Construct WWTP and collection system
120.00		Needs Category: I,IVA,IVB			
<b>Rank</b>		<b><u>Frankfort PSD Ph II</u></b>	\$13,073,000	\$15,500,000	<b>Problem</b>
26		County: Mineral			Failing septic systems and package plants
		SRF #C544: 411-02			
		NPDES #WV: 0010598			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 6/30/12			Extend sewer service to unserved areas
120.00		Needs Category: IIIA,IVA,IVB			
<b>Rank</b>		<b><u>Greater Paw Paw-Crown</u></b>	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	<b>Problem</b>
27		County: Monongalia			Failing septic systems
		SRF #C544: 479-			
		NPDES #WV: 0084130			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 9/30/12			Construct decentralized treatment and collection system
120.00		Needs Category: I,IVA,IVB			
<b>Rank</b>		<b><u>Lubeck PSD</u></b>	\$3,150,000	\$3,860,000	<b>Problem</b>
28		County: Wood			Failing septic systems
		SRF #C544: 453-			
		NPDES #WV: 0032590			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 3/31/12			Extend sewer service to unserved areas
120.00		Needs Category: IVA,IVB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI Storm Water Controls

Rank / Points		Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b>		<b>Moorefield</b>	\$18,083,513	\$37,743,513	<b>Problem</b>
29		County: Hardy			Need to comply with Chesapeake Bay nutrient criteria
		SRF #C544: 370-			
		NPDES #WV: 0020150			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 10/31/11			Construction new WWTP
120.00		Needs Category: I,IVB			
<b>Rank</b>		<b>Crab Orchard MacArthur-Rh</b>	\$760,200	\$4,510,200	<b>Problem</b>
30		County: Raleigh			Failing septic systems and direct discharges
		SRF #C544: 462-			
		NPDES #WV: 0082309			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 6/30/12			Construct WWTP and collection system
115.00		Needs Category: I,IVA,IVB			
<b>Rank</b>		<b>Pullman, Town of</b>	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	<b>Problem</b>
31		County: Ritchie			Failing septic systems
		SRF #C544: 138-			
		NPDES #WV:			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 9/30/12			Construction wastewater treatment and collection system
115.00		Needs Category: I,IVA,IVB			
<b>Rank</b>		<b>Shady Spring PSD-Cool Ridge</b>	\$3,436,991	\$13,148,400	<b>Problem</b>
32		County: Raleigh			Failing septic systems
		SRF #C544: 300-02			
		NPDES #WV: 0010575			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 6/30/12			Extend sewer service to unserved areas
115.00		Needs Category: IVA,IVB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI Storm Water Controls



Rank / Points		Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b>		<b>Hinton</b>	\$1,228,000	\$4,004,000	<b>Problem</b>
33		County: Summers			Failing septic systems
		SRF #C544: 391-			
		NPDES #WV: 0024732			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 12/31/11			Extend sewer service to unserved areas
105.00		Needs Category: I.IVA			
<b>Rank</b>		<b>Logan County PSD Ph IV B2</b>	\$1,000,000	\$4,570,000	<b>Problem</b>
34		County: Logan			Failing septic systems
		SRF #C544: 460-01			
		NPDES #WV: 0033821			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 9/30/12			Extend sewer service to unserved areas
105.00		Needs Category: IVA.IVB			
<b>Rank</b>		<b>Logan, City of</b>	\$10,946,960	\$11,946,960	<b>Problem</b>
35		County: Logan			Failing septic systems
		SRF #C544: 364-02			
		NPDES #WV: 0033821			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 9/30/12			Extend sewer service to unserved areas
105.00		Needs Category: IVA.IVB			
<b>Rank</b>		<b>Greater St. Albans PSD Ph III</b>	\$4,263,050	\$9,263,050	<b>Problem</b>
36		County: Kanawha			Failing septic systems and direct discharges
		SRF #C544: 406-03			
		NPDES #WV: 0035068			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 3/31/12			Extend sewer service to unserved areas
100.00		Needs Category: IVA.IVB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI Storm Water Controls

Rank / Points Project		SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b>	<b><u>Kingwood</u></b>	\$14,495,000	\$15,995,000	<b>Problem</b>
37	County: Preston			Failing septic systems and direct discharges,failing grinder pump system,compliance issue with WWTP
	SRF #C544: 450-01			
	NPDES #WV: 0021881			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>	Binding Date: 12/31/11			Upgrade the WWTP, replace grinder system with gravity sewer system, and extend sewer service to unserved areas
100.00	Needs Category: I,IIIA,IIIB,IVB,V			
<b>Rank</b>	<b><u>Logan County PSD Ph III B1</u></b>	\$1,000,000	\$4,900,000	<b>Problem</b>
38	County: Logan			Failing septic systems
	SRF #C544: 460-02			
	NPDES #WV: 0033821			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>	Binding Date: 9/30/12			Extend sewer service to unserved areas
100.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB			
<b>Rank</b>	<b><u>Logan County PSD Ph III B3</u></b>	\$1,000,000	\$4,780,000	<b>Problem</b>
39	County: Logan			Failing septic systems
	SRF #C544: 460-03			
	NPDES #WV: 0033821			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>	Binding Date: 9/30/12			Extend sewer service to unserved areas
100.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB			
<b>Rank</b>	<b><u>North Beckley PSD Ph III B</u></b>	\$3,458,240	\$4,958,200	<b>Problem</b>
40	County: Raleigh			Failing septic systems
	SRF #C544: 157-03			
	NPDES #WV: 0027740			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>	Binding Date: 9/30/12			Extend sewer service to unserved areas
100.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI Storm Water Controls

Rank / Points		Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b>		<b>St. Mary's, City of</b>	\$820,000	\$3,137,000	<b>Problem</b>
41		County: Pleasants			Excessive I/I
		SRF #C544: 468-			
		NPDES #WV: 0020165			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 12/31/11			Collection system rehabilitation
100.00		Needs Category: IIIB			
<b>Rank</b>		<b>War, City of</b>	\$400,000	\$2,900,000	<b>Problem</b>
42		County: War			Failing septic systems and direct discharge
		SRF #C544: 466-			
		NPDES #WV: 0040371			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 9/30/12			Extend sewer service to unserved areas
100.00		Needs Category: IVA.IVB			
<b>Rank</b>		<b>Beckley, City of</b>	\$4,212,100	\$4,212,100	<b>Problem</b>
43		County: Raleigh			Failing septic systems & CSO rehabilitation for compliance
		SRF #C544: 439-03			
		NPDES #WV: 0023183			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 12/31/11			Improvements include replacing existing sewer & extending sewer to provide service to an unserved area
91.00		Needs Category: IIIA,IVA,V			
<b>Rank</b>		<b>Harpers Ferry-Bolivar PSD</b>	\$2,230,672	\$4,461,343	<b>Problem</b>
44		County: Jefferson			Need to comply with Chesapeake Bay nutrient criteria
		SRF #C544: 429-			
		NPDES #WV: 0039136			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 9/30/12			Upgrade WWTP to meet Chesapeake Bays limits
90.00		Needs Category: II			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI Storm Water Controls

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> 45	<b>Flemington, Town of</b>  County: Taylor SRF #C544: 234- NPDES #WV: 0001054  Points: 88.00 Binding Date: 9/30/12 Needs Category: I,IVA,IVB	\$2,075,000	\$4,700,000	<b>Problem</b> Failing septic systems  <b>Solution</b> Extend sewer service to unserved areas, expand WWTP capacity
<b>Rank</b> 46	<b>Parkersburg, City of</b>  County: Wood SRF #C544: 420-02 NPDES #WV: 0023213  Points: 85.00 Binding Date: 9/30/12 Needs Category: IIIB,IVB	\$6,229,700	\$6,229,700	<b>Problem</b> Sanitary sewer overflows  <b>Solution</b> Increase pump station capacity to comply with DEP Order
<b>Rank</b> 47	<b>Granville, Town of</b>  County: Monongalia SRF #C544: 448- NPDES #WV: 0024988  Points: 82.00 Binding Date: 9/30/12 Needs Category: IIIA,IIIB	\$750,000	\$750,000	<b>Problem</b> Severe I/I issues  <b>Solution</b> Sanitary/Storm sewer separation and rehabilitation
<b>Rank</b> 48	<b>Point Pleasant, City of</b>  County: Mason SRF #C544: 082- NPDES #WV: 0022039  Points: 80.00 Binding Date: 3/31/12 Needs Category: V	\$4,070,000	\$4,070,000	<b>Problem</b> Working toward CSO compliance  <b>Solution</b> Sanitary/Storm sewer separation

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI Storm Water Controls

Rank / Points		Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b>		<b><u>Green Valley-Glenwood PSD</u></b>	\$500,000	\$1,000,000	<b>Problem</b>
49		County: Mercer			Sanitary sewer system overflows
		SRF #C544: 017-			
		NPDES #WV: 0082627			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 9/30/12			Upgrade collection system and wastewater treatment capacity
75.00		Needs Category: VI			
<b>Rank</b>		<b><u>Jefferson County PSD</u></b>	\$26,549,054	\$27,549,054	<b>Problem</b>
50		County: Jefferson			Need to comply with Chesapeake Bay nutrient criteria
		SRF #C544: 248-			
		NPDES #WV: 0084361			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 12/31/11			Construct new WWTP
75.00		Needs Category: I			
<b>Rank</b>		<b><u>Richwood, City of-WWTP Ph III</u></b>	\$8,691,000	\$8,691,000	<b>Problem</b>
51		County: Nicholas			Failing wastewater treatment plant
		SRF #C544: 308-03			
		NPDES #WV: 0022004			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 9/30/12			Construction new WWTP
75.00		Needs Category: I			
<b>Rank</b>		<b><u>Paden City, City of</u></b>	\$2,600,000	\$5,200,000	<b>Problem</b>
52		County: Wetzel			Excessive I/I
		SRF #C544: 418-			
		NPDES #WV: 0020613			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 9/30/12			Rehabilitation of existing sewer system
70.00		Needs Category: IIIB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI Storm Water Controls

Rank / Points Project		SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b>	<b><u>Ronceverte, City of</u></b>	\$18,898,000	\$20,898,000	<b>Problem</b>
53	County: Greenbrier			Need to comply with Greenbrier river phosphorus limits
	SRF #C544: 267-			
	NPDES #WV: 0023246			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>	Binding Date: 3/31/12			Upgrade WWTP
70.00	Needs Category: II,IIIB			
<b>Rank</b>	<b><u>South Charleston</u></b>	\$9,432,225	\$9,432,225	<b>Problem</b>
54	County: Kanawha			Excessive I/I, sanitary sewer overflows
	SRF #C544: 488-			
	NPDES #WV: 0023116			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>	Binding Date: 9/30/12			Collection system rehabilitation
70.00	Needs Category: I,IIIA			
<b>Rank</b>	<b><u>St. Albans-Green project</u></b>	\$1,567,280	\$1,567,280	<b>Problem</b>
55	County: Kanawha			High energy cost at the WWTP
	SRF #C544: 489-			
	NPDES #WV: 0023175			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>	Binding Date: 12/31/11			Construct energy efficient upgrades to the WWTP
70.00	Needs Category: I			
<b>Rank</b>	<b><u>Charleston, City of-Kan Two Mile</u></b>	\$25,877,009	\$25,877,009	<b>Problem</b>
56	County: Kanawha			Working toward CSO compliance
	SRF #C544: 272-			
	NPDES #WV: 0023205			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>	Binding Date: 10/31/11			Upgrade existing sanitary collection system by means of sewer pipe replacement or lining of existing sewer pipe
65.00	Needs Category: IIIB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI Storm Water Controls

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> 57	<b>Clarksburg, City of</b>  County: Harrison SRF #C544: 060-01 NPDES #WV: 0023302  Points: 65.00 Binding Date: 6/30/12 Needs Category: IIIB	\$9,800,000	\$9,800,000	<b>Problem</b> Working toward CSO compliance  <b>Solution</b> Upgrading the Clarksburg WWTP to handle flows up to 18 MDG
<b>Rank</b> 58	<b>Pratt, Town of</b>  County: Kanawha SRF #C544: 464- NPDES #WV: 0021784  Points: 65.00 Binding Date: 12/31/11 Needs Category: I,IIIA,IIIB	\$1,196,000	\$1,196,000	<b>Problem</b> Sanitary sewer overflows  <b>Solution</b> Rehabilitate collection system and WWTP to comply with DEP Order
<b>Rank</b> 59	<b>Cedar Grove, Town of</b>  County: Kanawha SRF #C544: 280- NPDES #WV: 0035637  Points: 60.00 Binding Date: 9/30/12 Needs Category: IIIB,V	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	<b>Problem</b> Severe I/I, working towards CSO compliance  <b>Solution</b> Line existing clay sewer lines, smoke test existing sewers & prepare CSO Long-Term Control Plan
<b>Rank</b> 60	<b>Hartford, Town of</b>  County: Mason SRF #C544: 470- NPDES #WV: 0080527  Points: 60.00 Binding Date: 10/31/11 Needs Category: IIIA,IIIB	\$273,260	\$2,000,735	<b>Problem</b> DEP Order mandating rehabilitation of 5 pump stations and 120 manholes  <b>Solution</b> Rehabilitate pump stations and manholes

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI Storm Water Controls

Rank / Points		Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b>		<b><u>Philippi, City of</u></b>	\$3,438,800	\$3,438,800	<b>Problem</b>
61		County: Barbour			CSO community where WWTP is past its useful life
		SRF #C544: 343-02			
		NPDES #WV: 0021857			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 12/31/11			Upgrade WWTP equipment
60.00		Needs Category: I			
<b>Rank</b>		<b><u>Reedsville, Town of</u></b>	\$1,770,000	\$3,433,700	<b>Problem</b>
62		County: Preston			Failing community septic system, Excessive I/I
		SRF #C544: 107-			
		NPDES #WV: 0010438			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 10/31/11			Extend sewer service to eliminate the community system and rehabilitate the collection system
60.00		Needs Category: IIIA,IVA,IVB			
<b>Rank</b>		<b><u>Winfield, Town of</u></b>	\$1,100,000	\$1,100,000	<b>Problem</b>
63		County: Putnam			Excessive I/I
		SRF #C544: 440-01			
		NPDES #WV: 0024503			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 9/30/12			Sewer system replacement
60.00		Needs Category: IIIB			
<b>Rank</b>		<b><u>Huntington, City of-13th ST</u></b>	\$10,208,300	\$10,208,300	<b>Problem</b>
64		County: Cabell			Working toward CSO compliance
		SRF #C544: 443-			
		NPDES #WV: 0023159			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 6/30/12			Upgrade pump station capacity to eliminate CSO overflows
55.00		Needs Category: IIIB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI Storm Water Controls



Rank / Points		Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b>		<b><u>Romney, City of</u></b>	\$5,100,000	\$13,700,000	<b>Problem</b>
65		County: Hampshire			Sanitary sewer overflows and comply with Chesapeake Bay nutrient criteria
		SRF #C544: 031-			
		NPDES #WV: 0020699			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 9/30/12			Construct new WWTP with increased capacity and comply with nutrient requirements
55.00		Needs Category: I,II,IIB			
<b>Rank</b>		<b><u>West Union, Town of</u></b>	\$2,537,000	\$2,537,000	<b>Problem</b>
66		County: Doddridge			Working toward CSO compliance
		SRF #C544: 441-			
		NPDES #WV: 0020109			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 9/30/12			Construction of new sanitary sewer system
55.00		Needs Category: V			
<b>Rank</b>		<b><u>Charles Town</u></b>	\$1,153,558	\$1,153,558	<b>Problem</b>
67		County: Jefferson			Need to comply with Chesapeake Bay nutrient criteria
		SRF #C544: 392-03			
		NPDES #WV: 0022349			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date:			Design an alternate force main from the Huntfield Pump Station to the Tuscowilla WWTP diverting flow from the Charles Town WWTP.
50.00		Needs Category: IVA			
<b>Rank</b>		<b><u>Elizabeth, Town of</u></b>	\$2,862,100	\$2,862,100	<b>Problem</b>
68		County: Wirt			Existing WWTP unable to meet NPDES Permit requirements, need to comply with DEP order
		SRF #C544: 143-			
		NPDES #WV: 0041505			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 6/30/12			Construct new .15 MGD WWTP
50.00		Needs Category: I			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI Storm Water Controls

Rank / Points		Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b>		<b><u>Greater Marion PSD</u></b>	\$3,700,000	\$5,700,000	<b>Problem</b>
69		County: Marion			Severe I/I issues causing vacuum failure
		SRF #C544: 251-02			
		NPDES #WV: 0080764			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 6/30/12			Replace the vacuum system of the gravity sewer system
35.00		Needs Category: IVA.IVB			
<b>Rank</b>		<b><u>Keyser, City of</u></b>	\$2,536,000	\$2,536,000	<b>Problem</b>
70		County: Mineral			Working towards CSO compliance
		SRF #C544: 486-			
		NPDES #WV: 0084042			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 9/30/12			Sanitary/Storm sewer separation
35.00		Needs Category: V			
<b>Rank</b>		<b><u>Pennsboro, City of</u></b>	\$443,618	\$2,091,000	<b>Problem</b>
71		County: Ritchie			Sanitary sewer overflows
		SRF #C544: 409-			
		NPDES #WV: 0025739			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 12/31/11			Upgrade WWTP capacity to comply with DEP Order
35.00		Needs Category: I			
<b>Rank</b>		<b><u>Grafton, City of</u></b>	\$2,969,820	\$4,469,820	<b>Problem</b>
72		County: Taylor			Working toward CSO compliance
		SRF #C544: 477-			
		NPDES #WV: 0021822			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>		Binding Date: 9/30/12			Rehabilitation of existing sewer system
30.00		Needs Category: V.VI			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI Storm Water Controls

Rank / Points		Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b>	<b><u>Northern Wayne County</u></b>		\$1,273,514	\$1,273,514	<b>Problem</b>
73	<b>County:</b>	Wayne			Excessive I/I, and excessive energy cost from grinder pumps
	<b>SRF #C544:</b>	455-			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>	0089621			<b>Solution</b>
<b>Points</b>	<b>Binding Date:</b>				Sewer system rehabilitation, and replacement of grinder system with gravity sewer system
30.00	<b>Needs Category:</b>	IIIA			

APPENDIX C

PROPOSED BINDING COMMITMENTS  
BY QUARTER

---

Appendix C - Binding Commitments and Cash Draw Proportionality  
Projects Budgeted for the Federal FY 2011 Grant

Name	Equiv.	Project Scope	Proj Num C-544____	Activity Code	State Fiscal Year 2012 (\$1,000)			
					1st Qtr July-Sept	2nd Qtr Oct-Dec	3rd Qtr Jan-Mar	4th Qtr Apr-June
Charleston	N	CSO Work	272	D2			25,877	
Kingwood	N	Upgrade/ext.	450	D2		15,795		
DEP Administration	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		0		
Total Projects and Admin					0	15,795	25,877	0

Federal Share (0.8333)					\$0.00	13,162	21,556	0	34,718
State Share (0.1667)					\$0.00	2,633	4,321	0	6,954
Total**					\$0.00	15,795	25,877	0	41,672

Activity Codes

P - facilities planning underway

D - design underway

D2 - design under review at DEP

D3 - design approved by DEP/bid process underway

\* No administrative costs will be used in this grant.

\*\* Any amounts exceeding the grant amount will come from repayments.

APPENDIX D

PROJECTS BUDGETED  
FOR IUP AVAILABLE FUNDS

---

## Appendix D - Projects Budgeted for FY 2012 Intended Use Plan

Name	Equiv.	Project Scope	Proj Num C-544___	Activity Code	State Fiscal Year 2012 (\$1,000)			
					1st Qtr July-Sept	2nd Qtr Oct-Dec	3rd Qtr Jan-Mar	4th Qtr Apr-June
Charles Town	N	C. Bay WWTP	392	D3	18,050			
Charleston	N	CSO work	272	D2			25,877	
Crab Orchard - MacArthur PSD	N	Coll. Sys/WWTP	257-04	D3	5,492			
Delbarton	Equiv.	Coll. Sys/WWTP	414	D3		5,131		
Jefferson County PSD	N	C. Bay WWTP	248	D3		26,484		
Kingwood	N	Ext./Upgrade	450	D2			15,795	
Lubeck	N	Coll. Sys	453	D3				3,150
Moorefield	Equiv.	C. Bay WWTP	370	D3		18,000		
Weston	N	CSO work	404-02	D3	1,049			
St. Marys	N	Coll. System	468	D2			3,536	
Pennsboro	Equiv.	WWTP Upgrade	409	D2				443
Philippi	N	WWTP Upgrade	343-02	D3				3,438
DEP Administration	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		0		
NPS - Agriculture	BMP	various	N/A	N/A	25	25	25	25
NPS - Onsite	BMP	various	N/A	N/A	300			
sub-total					24,916	49,640	45,233	7,056
grand total								126,845

The projects identified above are forecasted based upon the known current status of the project and individual knowledge as to readiness to proceed to construction within one year of receiving a binding commitment. Other projects not identified here may also receive a binding commitment if they proceed on a faster pace than expected or receive funding commitments from other agencies which requires a CWSRF commitment.

### Activity Codes

P - facilities planning underway

D - design underway

D2 - design under review at DEP

D3 - design approved by DEP/bid process underway

R - refinancing

File/ FY2012 IUP charts

APPENDIX E

PUBLIC HEARING  
SUMMARY

---





---

west virginia department of environmental protection

---

Division of Water and Waste Management  
601 57<sup>th</sup> Street, SE  
Charleston, West Virginia 25304  
Telephone: (304) 926-0495  
Fax: (304) 926-0496

Earl Ray Tomblin, Governor  
Randy C. Huffman, Cabinet Secretary  
[dep.wv.gov](http://dep.wv.gov)

## **“NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING”**

The West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection has scheduled a public hearing on July 22, 2011, at 1 pm to discuss the **Draft Fiscal Year 2012 Intended Use Plan** for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund Program (CWSRF). A part of the Intended Use Plan is the Fiscal Year 2012 Priority List. The hearing will take place at the DEP headquarters in Charleston in the New River Conference Room (Room #2129). A copy of the draft Fiscal Year 2012 Intended Use Plan is available, and may be requested by calling, writing or sending an email request to the address below. The plan can also be viewed on DEP's web site.

### **Contact**

Katheryn Emery  
WV Department of Environmental Protection  
Division of Water & Waste Management  
Clean Water State Revolving Fund  
601 57<sup>th</sup> Street, SE  
Charleston, WV 25304  
(304) 926-0499 Ext. 1596  
[Katheryn.D.Emery@wv.gov](mailto:Katheryn.D.Emery@wv.gov)

## **Public Hearing Summary**

There was one member of the public present at the hearing. A couple of minor wording changes were suggested by Ryan White, Jackson Kelly, bond counsel for the WV CWSRF. Mr. White suggested clarifying additional subsidization for green reserve project funding as well as clarifying the hybrid vehicles also means alternative fuel vehicles. There were no other comments.

The public hearing was conducted by CWSRF management. The attendance sheet is attached.

## CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND

FY 2012 INTENDED USE PLAN PUBLIC HEARING

JULY 22, 2011 – 1:00PM

## ATTENDANCE SHEET

[illegible]

APPENDIX F

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY  
MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT

---

**MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOMES AND AVERAGE BILLS**  
(2000 Census Data Used)

	Median HH Income	Average Bill Based on		
		2.00%	1.75%	1.50%
<b>Magisterial Districts</b>				
<b>B</b>				
Barbour				
North district	24,263	40.44	35.38	30.33
South district	24,669	41.12	35.98	30.84
West district	25,958	43.26	37.86	32.45
Berkeley				
Adam Stephens district	29,702	49.50	43.32	37.13
Norborne district	48,396	80.66	70.58	60.50
Potomac district	40,546	67.58	59.13	50.68
Shenandoah district	43,481	72.47	63.41	54.35
Tuscarora district	38,848	64.75	56.65	48.56
Valley district	41,896	69.83	61.10	52.37
Boone				
District 1	23,065	38.44	33.64	28.83
District 2	25,085	41.81	36.58	31.36
District 3	28,273	47.12	41.23	35.34
Braxton				
Eastern district	26,105	43.51	38.07	32.63
Northern district	26,265	43.78	38.30	32.83
Southern district	21,348	35.58	31.13	26.69
Western district	23,904	39.84	34.86	29.88
Brooke				
Buffalo district	39,964	66.61	58.28	49.96
Cross Creek district	36,435	60.73	53.13	45.54
Follansbee district	32,056	53.43	46.75	40.07
Weirton district	35,214	58.69	51.35	44.02
Wellsburg district	29,430	49.05	42.92	36.79
<b>C</b>				
Cabell				
District 1	29,681	49.47	43.28	37.10
District 2	18,016	30.03	26.27	22.52
District 3	23,735	39.56	34.61	29.67
District 4	36,056	60.09	52.58	45.07
District 5	33,808	56.35	49.30	42.26
Calhoun				
District 1	20,125	33.54	29.35	25.16
District 2	22,819	38.03	33.28	28.52
District 3	25,313	42.19	36.91	31.64
District 4	23,790	39.65	34.69	29.74
District 5	17,847	29.75	26.03	22.31

Clay				
District A	21,747	36.25	31.71	27.18
District B	17,857	29.76	26.04	22.32
District C	27,196	45.33	39.66	34.00
<b>D</b>				
Doddridge				
Beech district	26,800	44.67	39.08	33.50
Maple district	25,870	43.12	37.73	32.34
Oak district	31,047	51.75	45.28	38.81
Pine district	25,204	42.01	36.76	31.51
<b>F</b>				
Fayette				
New Haven district	26,075	43.46	38.03	32.59
Plateau district	23,697	39.50	34.56	29.62
Valley district	24,328	40.55	35.48	30.41
<b>G</b>				
Gilmer				
Center district	21,635	36.06	31.55	27.04
City district	20,243	33.74	29.52	25.30
De Kalb-Troy district	26,336	43.89	38.41	32.92
Glenville district	21,583	35.97	31.48	26.98
Grant				
Grant district	31,447	52.41	45.86	39.31
Milroy district	25,813	43.02	37.64	32.27
Union district	29,161	48.60	42.53	36.45
Greenbrier				
Central district	28,452	47.42	41.49	35.57
Eastern district	27,344	45.57	39.88	34.18
Western district	24,602	41.00	35.88	30.75
<b>H</b>				
Hampshire				
Bloomery district	35,765	59.61	52.16	44.71
Capon district	40,161	66.94	58.57	50.20
Gore district	30,128	50.21	43.94	37.66
Mill Creek district	33,086	55.14	48.25	41.36
Romney district	26,489	44.15	38.63	33.11
Sherman district	30,938	51.56	45.12	38.67
Springfield district	30,000	50.00	43.75	37.50
Hancock				
Butler district	36,667	61.11	53.47	45.83
Clay district	34,323	57.21	50.05	42.90
Grant district	31,225	52.04	45.54	39.03
Hardy				
Capon district	33,676	56.13	49.11	42.10
Lost River district	35,123	58.54	51.22	43.90
Moorefield district	27,904	46.51	40.69	34.88

Old Fields district	29,509	49.18	43.03	36.89
South Fork district	34,028	56.71	49.62	42.54
Harrison				
Eastern district	39,027	65.05	56.91	48.78
Northern district	28,113	46.86	41.00	35.14
North Urban district	24,834	41.39	36.22	31.04
Southern district	31,204	52.01	45.51	39.01
South Urban district	30,197	50.33	44.04	37.75
Southwest district	29,608	49.35	43.18	37.01
<b>J</b>				
Jackson				
Eastern district	30,111	50.19	43.91	37.64
Northern district	32,318	53.86	47.13	40.40
Western district	35,621	59.37	51.95	44.53
Jefferson				
Charles Town district	30,461	50.77	44.42	38.08
Harpers Ferry district	42,716	71.19	62.29	53.40
Kabletown district	53,571	89.29	78.12	66.96
Middleway district	42,372	70.62	61.79	52.97
Shepherdstown district	52,197	87.00	76.12	65.25
<b>K</b>				
Kanawha				
District 1	27,850	46.42	40.61	34.81
District 2	40,224	67.04	58.66	50.28
District 3	36,931	61.55	53.86	46.16
District 4	31,154	51.92	45.43	38.94
<b>L</b>				
Lewis				
Courthouse-Collins Settlement district	22,783	37.97	33.23	28.48
Freemans Creek district	26,100	43.50	38.06	32.63
Hackers Creek-Skin Creek district	30,878	51.46	45.03	38.60
Lincoln				
Carroll district	25,825	43.04	37.66	32.28
Duval district	20,794	34.66	30.32	25.99
Harts Creek district	21,129	35.22	30.81	26.41
Jefferson district	16,229	27.05	23.67	20.29
Laurel Hill district	16,875	28.13	24.61	21.09
Sheridan district	23,800	39.67	34.71	29.75
Union district	18,000	30.00	26.25	22.50
Washington district	35,580	59.30	51.89	44.48
Logan				
Central district	24,286	40.48	35.42	30.36
Eastern district	24,984	41.64	36.44	31.23
Western district	24,540	40.90	35.79	30.68
<b>M</b>				
Marion				

Middletown district	25,545	42.58	37.25	31.93
Palatine district	33,001	55.00	48.13	41.25
West Augusta district	27,287	45.48	39.79	34.11
Marshall				
District 1	33,150	55.25	48.34	41.44
District 2	23,107	38.51	33.70	28.88
District 3	36,000	60.00	52.50	45.00
Mason				
Arbuckle district	20,500	34.17	29.90	25.63
Clendenin district	26,451	44.09	38.57	33.06
Cologne district	25,700	42.83	37.48	32.13
Cooper district	25,161	41.94	36.69	31.45
Graham district	26,366	43.94	38.45	32.96
Hannan district	28,689	47.82	41.84	35.86
Lewis district	26,565	44.28	38.74	33.21
Robinson district	38,137	63.56	55.62	47.67
Union district	24,570	40.95	35.83	30.71
Waggener district	27,977	46.63	40.80	34.97
McDowell				
Big Creek district	16,749	27.92	24.43	20.94
Browns Creek district	18,701	31.17	27.27	23.38
North Elkin district	17,204	28.67	25.09	21.51
Sandy River district	15,163	25.27	22.11	18.95
Mercer				
District I	25,980	43.30	37.89	32.48
District II	26,522	44.20	38.68	33.15
District III	27,292	45.49	39.80	34.12
Mineral				
District 1	32,599	54.33	47.54	40.75
District 2	24,937	41.56	36.37	31.17
District 3	33,298	55.50	48.56	41.62
Mingo				
Hardee district	26,838	44.73	39.14	33.55
Harvey district	17,096	28.49	24.93	21.37
Kermit district	17,308	28.85	25.24	21.64
Lee district	23,504	39.17	34.28	29.38
Magnolia district	20,648	34.41	30.11	25.81
Stafford district	20,938	34.90	30.53	26.17
Tug River district	25,000	41.67	36.46	31.25
Williamson district	19,635	32.73	28.63	24.54
Monongalia				
Central district	20,493	34.16	29.89	25.62
Eastern district	33,586	55.98	48.98	41.98
Western district	31,467	52.45	45.89	39.33
Monroe				
Central district	26,641	44.40	38.85	33.30



Eastern district	29,716	49.53	43.34	37.15
Western district	27,274	45.46	39.77	34.09
Morgan				
District 1	30,357	50.60	44.27	37.95
District 2	35,688	59.48	52.05	44.61
District 3	40,240	67.07	58.68	50.30
District 4	33,587	55.98	48.98	41.98
<b>N</b>				
Nicholas				
Beaver district	23,868	39.78	34.81	29.84
Grant district	30,441	50.74	44.39	38.05
Hamilton district	27,417	45.70	39.98	34.27
Jefferson district	23,958	39.93	34.94	29.95
Kentucky district	26,984	44.97	39.35	33.73
Summersville district	30,383	50.64	44.31	37.98
Wilderness district	30,135	50.23	43.95	37.67
<b>O</b>				
Ohio				
District 1	35,424	59.04	51.66	44.28
District 2	23,604	39.34	34.42	29.51
District 3	32,760	54.60	47.78	40.95
<b>P</b>				
Pendleton				
Central district	31,349	52.25	45.72	39.19
Eastern district	31,494	52.49	45.93	39.37
Western district	26,737	44.56	38.99	33.42
Pleasants				
District A	34,574	57.62	50.42	43.22
District B	30,043	50.07	43.81	37.55
District C	30,190	50.32	44.03	37.74
District D	39,286	65.48	57.29	49.11
Pocahontas				
Edray district	24,437	40.73	35.64	30.55
Greenbank district	26,888	44.81	39.21	33.61
Huntersville district	27,266	45.44	39.76	34.08
Little Levels district	30,444	50.74	44.40	38.06
Preston				
Fifth district	24,433	40.72	35.63	30.54
First district	31,389	52.32	45.78	39.24
Fourth district	25,176	41.96	36.72	31.47
Second district	30,802	51.34	44.92	38.50
Third district	28,500	47.50	41.56	35.63
Putnam				
Buffalo-Union district	33,514	55.86	48.87	41.89
Curry district	40,109	66.85	58.49	50.14
Pocatalico district	36,175	60.29	52.76	45.22

Scott district	46,708	77.85	68.12	58.39
Teays district	53,444	89.07	77.94	66.81
<b>R</b>				
Raleigh				
District 1	28,802	48.00	42.00	36.00
District 2	27,295	45.49	39.81	34.12
District 3	28,675	47.79	41.82	35.84
Randolph				
Beverly district	30,991	51.65	45.20	38.74
Dry Fork district	26,875	44.79	39.19	33.59
Huttonsville district	24,750	41.25	36.09	30.94
Leadsville district	28,311	47.19	41.29	35.39
Middle Fork district	23,571	39.29	34.37	29.46
Mingo district	21,299	35.50	31.06	26.62
New Interest district	28,786	47.98	41.98	35.98
Roaring Creek district	23,989	39.98	34.98	29.99
Valley Bend district	29,750	49.58	43.39	37.19
Ritchie				
Clay district	30,938	51.56	45.12	38.67
Grant district	29,440	49.07	42.93	36.80
Murphy district	22,368	37.28	32.62	27.96
Union district	26,158	43.60	38.15	32.70
Roane				
Eastern district	22,534	37.56	32.86	28.17
Northern district	22,088	36.81	32.21	27.61
Southern district	26,274	43.79	38.32	32.84
Western district	28,382	47.30	41.39	35.48
<b>S</b>				
Summers				
Bluestone River district	24,275	40.46	35.40	30.34
Greenbrier River district	20,996	34.99	30.62	26.25
New River district	18,285	30.48	26.67	22.86
<b>T</b>				
Taylor				
Eastern district	25,506	42.51	37.20	31.88
Tygart district	23,848	39.75	34.78	29.81
Western district	32,488	54.15	47.38	40.61
Tucker				
Black Fork district	26,974	44.96	39.34	33.72
Clover district	24,671	41.12	35.98	30.84
Davis district	22,841	38.07	33.31	28.55
Dry Fork district	38,750	64.58	56.51	48.44
Fairfax district	21,164	35.27	30.86	26.46
Licking district	12,014	20.02	17.52	15.02
St. George district	33,194	55.32	48.41	41.49
Tyler				

Central district	28,289	47.15	41.25	35.36
North district	33,781	56.30	49.26	42.23
South district	27,188	45.31	39.65	33.99
West district	28,864	48.11	42.09	36.08
<b>U</b>				
Upshur				
First district	26,647	44.41	38.86	33.31
Second district	26,646	44.41	38.86	33.31
Third district	27,948	46.58	40.76	34.94
<b>W</b>				
Wayne				
Butler district	29,170	48.62	42.54	36.46
Ceredo district	28,071	46.79	40.94	35.09
Stonewall district	19,510	32.52	28.45	24.39
Union district	29,549	49.25	43.09	36.94
Westmoreland district	30,581	50.97	44.60	38.23
Webster				
Central district	20,175	33.63	29.42	25.22
Northern district	21,069	35.12	30.73	26.34
Southern district	21,555	35.93	31.43	26.94
Wetzel				
District 1	26,374	43.96	38.46	32.97
District 2	34,096	56.83	49.72	42.62
District 3	33,750	56.25	49.22	42.19
Wirt				
Central district	29,138	48.56	42.49	36.42
Northeast district	32,703	54.51	47.69	40.88
Southwest district	29,912	49.85	43.62	37.39
Wood				
Clay district	35,891	59.82	52.34	44.86
Harris district	33,382	55.64	48.68	41.73
Lubeck district	41,218	68.70	60.11	51.52
Parkersburg district	28,630	47.72	41.75	35.79
Slate district	37,609	62.68	54.85	47.01
Steele district	29,313	48.86	42.75	36.64
Tygart district	30,172	50.29	44.00	37.72
Union district	40,701	67.84	59.36	50.88
Walker district	27,372	45.62	39.92	34.22
Williams district	41,129	68.55	59.98	51.41
Wyoming				
District 1	24,152	40.25	35.22	30.19
District 2	23,009	38.35	33.55	28.76
District 3	24,973	41.62	36.42	31.22

APPENDIX F1

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY  
MUNICIPALITY AND COUNTY

---

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOMES AND AVERAGE BILLS  
(2000 Census Data Used)

	Median HH Income	Average Bill Based on		
		2.00%	1.75%	1.50%
<b>MUNICIPALITIES</b>				
<b>A</b>				
Addison (Webster Springs), town	20,592	34.32	30.03	25.74
Albright, town	21,389	35.65	31.19	26.74
Alderson, town	23,043	38.41	33.60	28.80
Anawalt, town	13,333	22.22	19.44	16.67
Anmoore, town	25,000	41.67	36.46	31.25
Ansted, town	25,028	41.71	36.50	31.29
Athens, town	27,260	45.43	39.75	34.08
Auburn, town	19,063	31.77	27.80	23.83
<b>B</b>				
Bancroft, town	28,833	48.06	42.05	36.04
Barboursville, village	35,139	58.57	51.24	43.92
Barrackville, town	31,587	52.65	46.06	39.48
Bath (Berkeley Springs), town	24,934	41.56	36.36	31.17
Bayard, town	25,156	41.93	36.69	31.45
Beckley, city	28,122	46.87	41.01	35.15
Beech Bottom, village	33,393	55.66	48.70	41.74
Belington, town	22,154	36.92	32.31	27.69
Belle, town	34,118	56.86	49.76	42.65
Belmont, city	27,375	45.63	39.92	34.22
Benwood, city	20,478	34.13	29.86	25.60
Bethany, town	36,375	60.63	53.05	45.47
Bethlehem, village	43,802	73.00	63.88	54.75
Beverly, town	21,875	36.46	31.90	27.34
Blacksville, town	31,250	52.08	45.57	39.06
Bluefield, city	27,672	46.12	40.36	34.59
Bolivar, town	42,375	70.63	61.80	52.97
Bradshaw, town	12,083	20.14	17.62	15.10
Bramwell, town	21,979	36.63	32.05	27.47
Brandonville, town	28,125	46.88	41.02	35.16
Bridgeport, city	49,310	82.18	71.91	61.64
Bruceton Mills, town	25,625	42.71	37.37	32.03
Buckhannon, city	23,421	39.04	34.16	29.28
Buffalo, town	26,481	44.14	38.62	33.10
Burnsville, town	24,167	40.28	35.24	30.21
<b>C</b>				
Cairo, town	24,688	41.15	36.00	30.86
Camden-on-Gauley, town	15,417	25.70	22.48	19.27
Cameron, city	25,119	41.87	36.63	31.40
Capon Bridge, town	30,750	51.25	44.84	38.44
Carpendale, town	35,404	59.01	51.63	44.26
Cedar Grove, town	23,250	38.75	33.91	29.06
Ceredo, city	24,323	40.54	35.47	30.40
Chapmanville, town	23,077	38.46	33.65	28.85
Charleston, city	34,009	56.68	49.60	42.51
Charles Town, city	32,538	54.23	47.45	40.67
Chesapeake, town	29,526	49.21	43.06	36.91
Chester, city	28,550	47.58	41.64	35.69
Clarksburg, city	27,722	46.20	40.43	34.65
Clay, town	14,712	24.52	21.46	18.39

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOMES AND AVERAGE BILLS  
(2000 Census Data Used)

	Median HH Income	Average Bill Based on		
		2.00%	1.75%	1.50%
Clearview, village	41,250	68.75	60.16	51.56
Clendenin, town	32,000	53.33	46.67	40.00
Corporation of Ranson Town	24,485	40.81	35.71	30.61
Cowen, town	21,250	35.42	30.99	26.56
<b>D</b>				
Danville, town	21,369	35.62	31.16	26.71
Davis, town	25,221	42.04	36.78	31.53
Davy, town	16,250	27.08	23.70	20.31
Delbarton, town	21,875	36.46	31.90	27.34
Dunbar, city	35,117	58.53	51.21	43.90
Durbin, town	23,462	39.10	34.22	29.33
<b>E</b>				
East Bank, town	35,341	58.90	51.54	44.18
Eleanor, town	35,284	58.81	51.46	44.11
Elizabeth, town	25,114	41.86	36.62	31.39
Elk Garden, town	24,375	40.63	35.55	30.47
Elkins, city	26,906	44.84	39.24	33.63
Ellenboro, town	22,500	37.50	32.81	28.13
<b>F</b>				
Fairmont, city	25,628	42.71	37.37	32.04
Fairview, town	24,896	41.49	36.31	31.12
Falling Spring, town	25,469	42.45	37.14	31.84
Farmington, town	29,375	48.96	42.84	36.72
Fayetteville, town	35,043	58.41	51.10	43.80
Flatwoods, town	29,500	49.17	43.02	36.88
Flemington, town	27,917	46.53	40.71	34.90
Follansbee, city	30,818	51.36	44.94	38.52
Fort Gay, town	14,565	24.28	21.24	18.21
Franklin, town	32,125	53.54	46.85	40.16
Friendly, town	33,571	55.95	48.96	41.96
<b>G</b>				
Gary, city	22,857	38.10	33.33	28.57
Gassaway, town	23,009	38.35	33.55	28.76
Gauley Bridge, town	22,500	37.50	32.81	28.13
Gilbert, town	29,219	48.70	42.61	36.52
Glasgow, town	35,526	59.21	51.81	44.41
Glen Dale, city	40,000	66.67	58.33	50.00
Glenville, town	20,243	33.74	29.52	25.30
Grafton, city	21,981	36.64	32.06	27.48
Grantsville, town	26,111	43.52	38.08	32.64
Grant Town, town	24,722	41.20	36.05	30.90
Granville, town	22,583	37.64	32.93	28.23
<b>H</b>				
Hambleton, town	23,625	39.38	34.45	29.53
Hamlin, town	22,143	36.91	32.29	27.68
Handley, town	21,429	35.72	31.25	26.79
Harman, town	21,136	35.23	30.82	26.42
Harpers Ferry, town	52,344	87.24	76.34	65.43
Harrisville, town	28,750	47.92	41.93	35.94
Hartford City, town	24,219	40.37	35.32	30.27
Hedgesville, town	49,375	82.29	72.01	61.72

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOMES AND AVERAGE BILLS  
(2000 Census Data Used)

	Median HH Income	Average Bill Based on		
		2.00%	1.75%	1.50%
Henderson, town	15,865	26.44	23.14	19.83
Hendricks, town	26,705	44.51	38.94	33.38
Hillsboro, town	29,583	49.31	43.14	36.98
Hinton, city	20,323	33.87	29.64	25.40
Hundred, town	25,192	41.99	36.74	31.49
Huntington, city	23,234	38.72	33.88	29.04
Hurricane, city	39,591	65.99	57.74	49.49
Huttonsville, town	22,321	37.20	32.55	27.90
<b>I</b>				
Iaeger, town	14,886	24.81	21.71	18.61
<b>J</b>				
Jane Lew, town	23,571	39.29	34.37	29.46
Jefferson, town	16,384	27.31	23.89	20.48
Junior, town	20,536	34.23	29.95	25.67
<b>K</b>				
Kenova, city	23,342	38.90	34.04	29.18
Kermit, town	31,500	52.50	45.94	39.38
Keyser, city	23,718	39.53	34.59	29.65
Keystone, city	10,417	17.36	15.19	13.02
Kimball, town	17,333	28.89	25.28	21.67
Kingwood, city	29,155	48.59	42.52	36.44
<b>L</b>				
Leon, town	21,429	35.72	31.25	26.79
Lester, town	24,375	40.63	35.55	30.47
Lewisburg, city	27,857	46.43	40.62	34.82
Littleton, town	15,714	26.19	22.92	19.64
Logan, city	22,623	37.71	32.99	28.28
Lost Creek, town	26,563	44.27	38.74	33.20
Lumberport, town	33,750	56.25	49.22	42.19
<b>M</b>				
Mabscott, town	28,021	46.70	40.86	35.03
McMechen, city	27,179	45.30	39.64	33.97
Madison, city	29,911	49.85	43.62	37.39
Man, town	40,179	66.97	58.59	50.22
Mannington, city	26,806	44.68	39.09	33.51
Marlinton, town	21,293	35.49	31.05	26.62
Marmet, city	29,779	49.63	43.43	37.22
Martinsburg, city	29,495	49.16	43.01	36.87
Mason, town	24,621	41.04	35.91	30.78
Masontown, town	22,750	37.92	33.18	28.44
Matewan, town	13,529	22.55	19.73	16.91
Matoaka, town	17,159	28.60	25.02	21.45
Meadow Bridge, town	23,194	38.66	33.82	28.99
Middlebourne, town	28,704	47.84	41.86	35.88
Mill Creek, town	24,886	41.48	36.29	31.11
Milton, town	29,348	48.91	42.80	36.69
Mitchell Heights, town	52,500	87.50	76.56	65.63
Monongah, town	25,750	42.92	37.55	32.19
Montgomery, city	20,606	34.34	30.05	25.76
Montrose, town	33,571	55.95	48.96	41.96
Moorefield, town	24,178	40.30	35.26	30.22

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOMES AND AVERAGE BILLS  
(2000 Census Data Used)

	Median HH Income	Average Bill Based on		
		2.00%	1.75%	1.50%
Morgantown, city	20,649	34.42	30.11	25.81
Moundsville, city	23,107	38.51	33.70	28.88
Mount Hope, city	18,375	30.63	26.80	22.97
Mullens, city	27,742	46.24	40.46	34.68
<b>N</b>				
Newburg, town	24,063	40.11	35.09	30.08
New Cumberland, city	28,529	47.55	41.60	35.66
New Haven, town	27,008	45.01	39.39	33.76
New Martinsville, city	33,750	56.25	49.22	42.19
Nitro, city	32,389	53.98	47.23	40.49
Northfork, town	16,544	27.57	24.13	20.68
North Hills, town	83,659	139.43	122.00	104.57
Nutter Fort, town	30,163	50.27	43.99	37.70
<b>O</b>				
Oak Hill, city	24,792	41.32	36.16	30.99
Oakvale, town	22,500	37.50	32.81	28.13
Oceana, town	19,273	32.12	28.11	24.09
<b>P</b>				
Paden City, city	32,940	54.90	48.04	41.18
Parkersburg, city	26,990	44.98	39.36	33.74
Parsons, city	26,424	44.04	38.54	33.03
Paw Paw, town	25,625	42.71	37.37	32.03
Pax, town	21,875	36.46	31.90	27.34
Pennsboro, city	24,120	40.20	35.18	30.15
Petersburg, city	24,867	41.45	36.26	31.08
Peterstown, town	23,036	38.39	33.59	28.80
Philippi, city	21,528	35.88	31.40	26.91
Piedmont, town	21,190	35.32	30.90	26.49
Pine Grove, town	25,769	42.95	37.58	32.21
Pineville, town	31,008	51.68	45.22	38.76
Pleasant Valley, city	33,686	56.14	49.13	42.11
Poca, town	42,273	70.46	61.65	52.84
Point Pleasant, city	27,022	45.04	39.41	33.78
Pratt, town	37,500	62.50	54.69	46.88
Princeton, city	21,736	36.23	31.70	27.17
Pullman, town	19,821	33.04	28.91	24.78
<b>Q</b>				
Quinwood, town	21,705	36.18	31.65	27.13
<b>R</b>				
Rainelle, town	19,491	32.49	28.42	24.36
Ravenswood, city	30,308	50.51	44.20	37.89
Reedsville, town	32,273	53.79	47.06	40.34
Reedy, town	17,000	28.33	24.79	21.25
Rhodell, town	17,143	28.57	25.00	21.43
Richwood, city	21,620	36.03	31.53	27.03
Ridgeley, town	26,016	43.36	37.94	32.52
Ripley, city	25,861	43.10	37.71	32.33
Rivesville, town	25,700	42.83	37.48	32.13
Romney, city	22,261	37.10	32.46	27.83
Ronceverte, city	24,400	40.67	35.58	30.50
Rowlesburg, town	28,125	46.88	41.02	35.16



MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOMES AND AVERAGE BILLS  
(2000 Census Data Used)

	Median HH Income	Average Bill Based on		
		2.00%	1.75%	1.50%
Rupert, town	20,250	33.75	29.53	25.31
<b>S</b>				
St. Albans, city	37,130	61.88	54.15	46.41
St. Marys, city	30,755	51.26	44.85	38.44
Salem, city	16,577	27.63	24.17	20.72
Sand Fork, town	30,179	50.30	44.01	37.72
Shepherdstown, town	40,750	67.92	59.43	50.94
Shinnston, city	26,786	44.64	39.06	33.48
Sistersville, city	26,799	44.67	39.08	33.50
Smithers, city	20,417	34.03	29.77	25.52
Smithfield, town	18,500	30.83	26.98	23.13
Sophia, town	26,008	43.35	37.93	32.51
South Charleston, city	37,905	63.18	55.28	47.38
Spencer, city	19,773	32.96	28.84	24.72
Star City, town	26,771	44.62	39.04	33.46
Stonewood, city	28,000	46.67	40.83	35.00
Summersville, town	29,783	49.64	43.43	37.23
Sutton, town	25,134	41.89	36.65	31.42
Sylvester, town	35,625	59.38	51.95	44.53
<b>T</b>				
Terra Alta, town	25,388	42.31	37.02	31.74
Thomas, city	22,443	37.41	32.73	28.05
Thurmond, town	23,750	39.58	34.64	29.69
Triadelphia, town	26,169	43.62	38.16	32.71
Tunnelton, town	18,125	30.21	26.43	22.66
<b>U</b>				
Union, town	21,797	36.33	31.79	27.25
<b>V</b>				
Valley Grove, village	27,813	46.36	40.56	34.77
Vienna, city	39,220	65.37	57.20	49.03
<b>W</b>				
War, city	16,012	26.69	23.35	20.02
Wardensville, town	28,864	48.11	42.09	36.08
Wayne, town	20,242	33.74	29.52	25.30
Weirton, city	35,212	58.69	51.35	44.02
Welch, city	19,795	32.99	28.87	24.74
Wellsburg, city	27,298	45.50	39.81	34.12
West Hamlin, town	19,250	32.08	28.07	24.06
West Liberty, town	28,393	47.32	41.41	35.49
West Logan, town	23,500	39.17	34.27	29.38
West Milford, town	32,250	53.75	47.03	40.31
Weston, city	26,690	44.48	38.92	33.36
Westover, city	28,659	47.77	41.79	35.82
West Union, town	18,300	30.50	26.69	22.88
Wheeling, city	27,388	45.65	39.94	34.24
Whitehall, town	42,813	71.36	62.44	53.52
White Sulphur Springs, city	26,694	44.49	38.93	33.37
Whitesville, town	19,250	32.08	28.07	24.06
Williamson, city	19,635	32.73	28.63	24.54
Williamstown, city	36,344	60.57	53.00	45.43
Windsor Heights, village	28,523	47.54	41.60	35.65

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOMES AND AVERAGE BILLS  
(2000 Census Data Used)

	Median HH Income	Average Bill Based on		
		2.00%	1.75%	1.50%
Winfield, town	51,023	85.04	74.41	63.78
Womelsdorf (Coalton), town	28,462	47.44	41.51	35.58
Worthington, town	28,750	47.92	41.93	35.94

MHI AND AVERAGE BILLS FOR WV CENSUS DESIGNATED PLACES  
(2000 Census Data Used)

	Median HH Income	Average Bill Based on		
		2.00%	1.75%	1.50%
<b>CDPs</b>				
<b>A</b>				
Alum Creek CDP	40,714	67.86	59.37	50.89
Amherstdale-Robinette CDP	28,512	47.52	41.58	35.64
<b>B</b>				
Beaver CDP	25,863	43.11	37.72	32.33
Blennerhassett CDP	51,250	85.42	74.74	64.06
Boaz CDP	39,250	65.42	57.24	49.06
Bradley CDP	28,844	48.07	42.06	36.06
Brookhaven CDP	32,206	53.68	46.97	40.26
<b>C</b>				
Cassville CDP	25,799	43.00	37.62	32.25
Chattaroy CDP	31,563	52.61	46.03	39.45
Cheat Lake CDP	48,594	80.99	70.87	60.74
Coal City CDP	28,049	46.75	40.90	35.06
Coal Fork CDP	26,250	43.75	38.28	32.81
Crab Orchard CDP	29,932	49.89	43.65	37.42
Craigsville CDP	24,631	41.05	35.92	30.79
Cross Lanes CDP	45,334	75.56	66.11	56.67
Culloden CDP	39,135	65.23	57.07	48.92
<b>D</b>				
Daniels CDP	27,955	46.59	40.77	34.94
Despard CDP	19,740	32.90	28.79	24.68
<b>E</b>				
Elkview CDP	35,033	58.39	51.09	43.79
Enterprise CDP	29,583	49.31	43.14	36.98
<b>F</b>				
Fairlea CDP	20,664	34.44	30.14	25.83
Fort Ashby CDP	32,375	53.96	47.21	40.47
<b>G</b>				
Gilbert Creek CDP	16,625	27.71	24.24	20.78
<b>H</b>				
Harts CDP	21,703	36.17	31.65	27.13
Holden CDP	23,510	39.18	34.29	29.39
Hooverson Heights CDP	37,101	61.84	54.11	46.38
<b>I</b>				
Inwood CDP	41,033	68.39	59.84	51.29
<b>L</b>				
Lubeck CDP	42,614	71.02	62.15	53.27
<b>M</b>				
MacArthur CDP	29,607	49.35	43.18	37.01

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOMES AND AVERAGE BILLS  
(2000 Census Data Used)

	Median HH Income	Average Bill Based on		
		2.00%	1.75%	1.50%
Mallory CDP	24,458	40.76	35.67	30.57
Mineral Wells CDP	42,083	70.14	61.37	52.60
Montcalm CDP	20,435	34.06	29.80	25.54
Mount Gay-Shamrock CDP	18,975	31.63	27.67	23.72
<b>N</b>				
Newell CDP	31,343	52.24	45.71	39.18
<b>P</b>				
Pea Ridge CDP	41,739	69.57	60.87	52.17
Pinch CDP	46,516	77.53	67.84	58.15
Piney View CDP	26,324	43.87	38.39	32.91
Powelton CDP	23,224	38.71	33.87	29.03
Prosperity CDP	31,632	52.72	46.13	39.54
<b>R</b>				
Red Jacket CDP	21,364	35.61	31.16	26.71
<b>S</b>				
Shady Spring CDP	29,464	49.11	42.97	36.83
Sissonville CDP	36,725	61.21	53.56	45.91
Stanaford CDP	30,640	51.07	44.68	38.30
Switzer CDP	21,806	36.34	31.80	27.26
<b>T</b>				
Teays Valley CDP	53,053	88.42	77.37	66.32
Tornado CDP	50,000	83.33	72.92	62.50
<b>W</b>				
Washington CDP	54,483	90.81	79.45	68.10
Wiley Ford CDP	32,017	53.36	46.69	40.02

Census Designated Places are closely settled, named, unincorporated communities that generally contain a mixture of residential, commercial, and retail areas similar to those found in incorporated places of similar sizes.

APPENDIX G

SOURCES AND USES CHART  
(FOR EPA USE ONLY)

---

West Virginia Clean Water State Revolving Fund  
Intended Use Plan - Sources and Uses of Funds  
FY2012  
(for EPA use only)

**Cumulative Sources as of June 30, 2011**

Capitalization Grants (21)	508,555,586	
State Matches (actual)	89,516,273	
Repayments (P + I; 212 + 319)	235,536,771	
Investment Earnings	28,968,916	
Sources sub-total (a)		862,577,546

**Cumulative Uses as of June 30, 2011**

Loan Assistance (212+319)	778,863,271	
DEP Administration (4%)	14,143,540	
Uses sub-total (b)		793,006,811

**FY2012 Sources of Funds**

Available funds from prior IUPs (a - b)	69,570,735	
Capitalization Grant #22 (FY2011 Funds)	23,019,000	
State Match	4,603,800	
Earnings	172,000	
Repayments	<u>28,092,967</u>	
FY2011 Sources of Funds ( c )		125,458,502

**FY2012 Reserves**

AgWQLP Reserve	100,000	
On Site Loan Program Reserve	300,000	
DEP Administration	<u>0</u>	
FY2011 Set-Asides ( d )	400,000	

Net Available Funds during FY2012 (c - d)	125,058,502	
Less existing binding commitments: 10 @	119,030,432	
Uncommitted funds available:	6,028,070	

## APPENDIX H

# POSSIBLE GREEN TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS

---

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND

## "Green" Infrastructure Project Solicitation for FY2012 IUP

Project	Category	Description	Cost Estimate
Berkeley County	storm water	construction	\$5,957,405
Bluefield Sanitary Bd	energy efficiency/savings	ps rehab / construction	\$2,926,750
Bluefield Sanitary Bd	storm water	construction parking lot	\$832,961
Bluefield, Sanitary Bd	energy efficiency/savings	construction	\$2,290,800
	storm water	ps rehab / construction	\$1,846,513
Boone County PSD	energy efficiency/savings		
Crab Orchard/Mac PSD	decentralized sewer system	gravity sewage	\$1,024,200
Crab Orchard/Mac PSD	decentralized sewer system	packaged ext. aer. Plant	\$508,200
Greater Paw Paw	decentralized sewer system	construction	\$1,014,255
	energy efficiency/savings	installation telemetry	\$142,892
Harpers Ferry, Corp	water reuse		
	energy efficiency/savings	Install permanent cover over sed basin	\$112,135
Harpers Ferry, Corp	water reuse	new line for cleaning	
	energy efficiency/savings	Install new scales and other CI equipment	\$19,875
Harpers Ferry, Corp	water reuse		
Huntington San. Bd.	storm water	construction	\$830,000
Jefferson Co. PSD	storm water	green roof	\$983,169
Jefferson Co. PSD	storm water	permeable asphalt	\$318,599
Lincoln Co. Comm.	decentralized sewer system	construction	\$607,353
	storm water	cso abatement	\$4,894,960
Marlinton, Town of		plant improvement	
McMechen, City of	storm water	replacement	\$277,000
Northern Wayne	energy efficiency/savings	construction	\$168,000
Parkersburg Utility Board	energy efficiency/savings	rehabilitation	\$4,259,400
Point Pleasant, City of	storm water	cso abatement	\$4,430,000
Preston County PSD	decentralized sewer system	construction/ext	\$1,805,000
Putnam PSD	energy efficiency/savings	install hydropower	\$190,000
	energy efficiency/savings	install ultrasound units	\$25,460
Putnam PSD	water reuse		
Ranson, City of / Ranson Green LLC	decentralized sewer system	construction	\$9,300,000
St. Albans MUC	energy efficiency/savings	replacement	\$1,458,390
Weirton Sanitary Bd	energy efficiency/savings	eliminate/connect	\$800,000
West Fork	decentralized sewer system	contruction	\$5,226,705
	storm water	storm water separation	\$2,537,000
West Union, Town of	energy efficiency/savings		
Wheeling, City of	energy efficiency/savings	replacement	\$1,155,000
Wheeling, City of	energy efficiency/savings	grit removal	\$800,000
White Sulphur Springs	water reuse	upgrade	\$1,115,000
Wood Co. Commission	storm water	installation	\$788,000
TOTAL			\$59,854,218